

302187

JPRS-TAC-85-028

6 September 1985

## Worldwide Report

# ARMS CONTROL

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for public release;  
Distribution Unlimited

19980722 159

**FBIS**

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

REPRODUCED BY  
NATIONAL TECHNICAL  
INFORMATION SERVICE  
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
SPRINGFIELD, VA. 22161

10  
142  
A07

#### NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

#### PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

6 September 1985

## WORLDWIDE REPORT

### ARMS CONTROL

#### GENERAL

Danish Prime Minister in Prague Urges Conventional Arms Cut (Michael Kuttner; Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE, 25 Jun 85)	1
Potential Danish Eureka Project Contributors Named (Kermit Norlund; Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE, 19 Jul 85)	3

#### U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

PRAVDA Publishes Gorbachev Speech Threatening 'Reassessment' (Moscow PRAVDA, 27 Jun 85; Moscow TASS, 10 Jul 85) .....	5
PRAVDA Version of Speech	5
Circulated as UN Document	7
USSR: Gloomy Comments on Results of Second Round (Various sources, various dates) .....	8
White House Statement Criticized	8
Western Press Criticized	9
Gorbachev Cited on 'Reassessment', by Vsevolod Shishkovskiy	10
Soviet Deployment Moratorium Recalled, by Vsevolod Shishkovskiy	11
Space Arms Ban Essential	12
PRAVDA: No Progress, by B. Dubrovin	13
USSR Will Not 'Participate in Games', by Vitaliy Kobysh	15
PRAVDA: "SDI 'Main Obstacle', by Nikolay Prozhogin	16
McFarlane Remarks Criticized	18
U.S. 'Pessimism' Hit, by Vitaliy Kobysh	19
PRAVDA on Congressional Funding of MX, Midgetman, Bombers, SDI (A. Tolkunov; Moscow PRAVDA, 23 Jul 85) .....	21
TASS Commentary Says Rowny Distorts Soviet Proposals (Moscow TASS, 24 Jul 85) .....	22

USSR Gen Chervov: U.S. 'Tactics of Procrastination, Blackmail' (Nikolay Chervov; Bratislava PRAVDA, 11 Jul 85) .....	24
Hungary: Progress May Depend on U.S.-USSR Summit (Budapest Domestic Service, 21 Jul 85) .....	27
SPACE ARMS	
TASS on SDI Discussion at Upcoming NATO Assembly Session (Moscow TASS, 10 Aug 85) .....	28
IZVESTIYA Links Space Shuttle With SDI Testing (Moscow IZVESTIYA, 8 Aug 85) .....	29
PRAVDA Commentary on European Doubts Over SDI (G. Vorontsov; Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW, 11 Jul 85) .....	30
Moscow to Japan: Japanese 'Tacit Support' of SDI (Moscow in Japanese to Japan, 7 Aug 85) .....	34
IZVESTIYA Sees Peaceful, Military Applications for Eureka (Yu. Kovelenco; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 9 Aug 85) .....	36
Europeans Move Toward Concerted Effort on Eureka Project (Paris L'HUMANITE, 25 Jun 85; Paris LE MONDE, 27 Jun 85)	38
Matra, Norsk Data Agreement, by Julien Pierre	38
Electronics Giants Favorable, by Eric le Boucher	39
French Defense Minister on Eureka (Claude Hernu Interview; Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network, 21 Jul 85) .....	41
FRG Defense Minister Welcomes Weapons Proposals (Hamburg DPA, 22 Jul 85) .....	43
FRG Minister on Funding, Industry Under Eureka (Heinz Riesenhuber Interview; Hamburg ARD Television Network, 19 Jul 85) .....	44
Netherlands Paper Perceives Pitfalls for Eureka Scheme (Editorial; Amsterdam DE VOLKSKRANT, 19 Jul 85) .....	46
Spanish Article Analyzes Eureka, SDI Implications (Carlos Gomez; Madrid EL PAIS, 14 Jul 85) .....	48
Briefs	
No FRG Funds for SDI, Eureka	51



## SALT/START ISSUES

Moscow Hits U.S., Claims of Soviet SALT Violations (Moscow World Service, 7 Aug 85; Moscow TASS, 10 Aug 85) .	52
Krasnoyarsk Radar 'Smokescreen' for Buildup	52 53
TASS Criticizes U.S. Pave Paws Radar (Moscow TASS, 14 Aug 85; Moscow TASS International Service, 14 Aug 85) .....	54
Violates AMB Treaty 'Star Wars' Role Seen	54 54
Soviet Army Paper Lampoons U.S. SALT II Violation Charges (I. Nikolayev; Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA, 3 Jul 85) .....	56

## INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR: Euromissiles, SDI Undermine 1970 USSR-FRG Treaty ( no sourceline given)	59
PRAVDA Commentary, by Ye. Grigoryev CPSU Official in FRG Paper, by Nikolay Portugalov	59 61
TASS Rejoinder on Thatcher Comment on UK, French Deterrent Forces (Moscow TASS, 6 Aug 85) .....	64
Moscow to Japan: U.S. Nuclear Deployments Highlighted (Moscow in Japanese to Japan, 9 Aug 85) .....	65

## MUTUAL AND BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS

Polish Reports, Comments on End of 36th Round (Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU, 21 Jun, 13-14 Jul 85) .....	67
20 June Session	67
27 June Session	67
Chief Delegate Comments	68

## NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

Danish Government Joining Zone Conference in Consensus Search (Solveig Rodsgaard; Copenhagen BERLINGSKE WEEKENDAVISEN, 14-20 Jun 85) .....	69
Danish Paper Denies Need for Nordic Nuclear-Free Zone (Editorial; Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE, 24 Jun 85) ....	73
New Zealand Premier Challenges U.S. on Public Opinion (Wellington THE EVENING POST, 12 Aug 85) .....	75
New Zealand Politician Hits Antinuclear Stance in Sydney (Melbourne Overseas Service, 11 Aug 85) .....	77

Briefs	
NZ Leader on Ban Legislation	78
Australian on New Zealand, French Stands	78
NUCLEAR TESTING	
TASS Interviews Gorbachev on Moratorium (Moscow TASS, 13 Aug 85) .....	79
USSR: Western Praise of Moratorium Proposal (Moscow TASS, 1 Aug 85; Moscow Television Service, 1 Aug 85) .....	83
WASHINGTON POST Comments	83
Positive Response Urged by Physicians	83
Defense Information Center Response to Proposal	84
USSR: Criticism of U.S. Response to Moratorium Offer (Various sources, various dates) .....	85
Verification Issue, by Boris Belitskiy	85
Army Paper Commentary, by Ye. Nikitin	86
U.S. 'Guilt' on Hiroshima	90
U.S. 'Nervousness', by Dmitriy Biryukov	91
Reagan Statements 'Confused'	92
Ridgeway Remarks Criticized	93
U.S. Said Ahead on Tests, by Yuriy Soltan	94
'Protracted' Nuclear War Plans	95
Security Argument Refuted	96
Star Wars Connection	97
Perle Speech Criticized, by V. Ovchinnikov	98
U.S. Objections Refuted, by Viktor Olin	99
U.S. Seeks Superiority, by Konstantin Patsyuk, et al.	100
U.S. Alleges Propaganda, by Eduard Mnatsakanov	102
U.S. Arguments Disputed, by Valentin Zorin	103
Bovin Article, by Aleksandr Bovin	104
U.S. Motives Assailed, by Vitaliy Kobysh	108
USSR Further Criticizes U.S. Response to Moratorium (Various sources, various dates) .....	111
Reasons for Reluctance, by Oleg Blinov	111
Moscow to Japan, by Yuriy Afonin	111
PRAVDA Editorial 1 Aug	113
Disarmament Envoy's Comments Hit	114
U.S. Invitation Called 'Propaganda Trick'	115
Reagan Press Conference	116
Reagan 'Completely Confused'	117
U.S. Continued Testing	118
Military Paper Comment, Editorial	119
Assistant Secretary Refuted	121

U.S. 'Sidestepping' Issue, by V. Matveyev	122
PRAVDA Editorial 10 Aug	125
Weekly Talk Show 11 Aug, by Vladimir Borisovich Lomeyko, et al.	127
U.S. 'Avoiding' Proposal	130
SDI Connection Alleged	131
Soviet Broadcast to Japan on Hiroshima, Moratorium (Serbin; Moscow in Japanese to Japan, 5 Aug 85) .....	133
Briefs	
Gorbachev Statement Circulated at UN	135

GENERAL

# DANISH PRIME MINISTER IN PRAGUE URGES CONVENTIONAL ARMS CUT

Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE in Danish 25 Jun 85 p 6

[Article by Michael Kuttner]

[Text] Prague--The prime minister told Czech government leaders that a balance in the conventional area would make Europeans less dependent on the nuclear umbrella.

"If the East Europeans make cuts in their conventional military forces so that there is a balance between East and West in this area Denmark and other countries would be less dependent on the nuclear umbrella of the great powers."

Poul Schluter said that yesterday during a talk with Czech President Gustav Husak before leaving for home with his wife at the end of a 3-day official visit. On the last day of Schluter's first visit to an eastern nation since he became prime minister he also invited Czech Prime Minister Lubomir Strougal to come to Denmark.

## Opposed to Space Defense

"Respecting human rights will have a much greater effect on international understanding than the removal of a few missiles," Poul Schluter said at a press conference just before his departure. It has attracted attention in the course of the visit that the prime minister has stressed respect for human rights more clearly than any other western leader.

At the press conference Poul Schluter was asked by Czech TV what he thought of President Ronald Reagan's so-called star wars plans, SDI--a research project that has been sharply rejected by the Soviet Union and other East bloc countries.

Schluter started off by asserting that "the Soviet Union has quite naturally been carrying out research for many years into how a space defense could be built up that would make it totally or partially impossible for hostile machines to reach Soviet territory for the purpose of destroying it.

"President Reagan is thinking of something along those lines," Schluter said. "But," he stated, "I am opposed to these plans for two reasons. In the first place I do not believe such projects can be sufficiently effective or reliable. In the second place they are too expensive. Such plans require the investment of billions on both sides and the money could be used in more sensible ways."

#### Arms Reduction Plan

The prime minister revealed that in his talks with President Husak and Prime Minister Strougal he had introduced "a new idea" instead.

"If we could achieve a reduction in the conventional defense area in Europe it would make us less dependent on the nuclear umbrella. One can discuss which great power has the most nuclear weapons," Schluter continued. "But the Soviet bloc is clearly superior in the conventional area. And that is not necessary. Parity should be enough."

The prime minister called such a conventional arms reduction plan "perhaps a 10-year project" that "could make it easier for the western countries to accept their independence from the terrible nuclear umbrella."

In response to a question from a correspondent for the East German news agency ADN Schluter said that he would like to see "a secure agreement on a Nordic nuclear-free zone, especially if this zone can be extended down through central Europe and as far as possible on both sides of the dividing line."

"But," the prime minister emphasized, "I do not think such zones provide genuine and reliable security. The zone concept is too limited. In addition I do not believe that if there was a really catastrophic war the great powers would be so obliging as to avoid the Nordic countries just because we have declared a Nordic nuclear-free zone. That sounds like a Hans Christian Andersen fairy tale."

On the cultural side the prime minister has repeatedly shown great interest during his stay in Czechoslovakia in the historic past of this nation and its neighbors--a past that still greatly affects them. Danish delegation sources had the impression that during the visit Poul Schluter was urged to concern himself more with eastern Europe than he has in the past. Hungary is named as the most likely destination for the prime minister's next visit to eastern Europe.

6578

CSO: 5200/2699

GENERAL

POTENTIAL DANISH EUREKA PROJECT CONTRIBUTORS NAMED

PM231327 Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE in Danish 19 Jul 85

[Kermit Norlund report: "Here Are the Danish Eureka Projects"]

[Text] Brussels -- In a confidential document the Danish Foreign Ministry has proposed 10 of Denmark's most advanced companies and one research institute as the first team of "Eureka participants." BERLINGSKE TIDENDE is here able to reveal the contents of the 12 projects the Danish ministerial delegation took with it to Paris when the multinational research program was launched.

AS De Danske Sukkerfabrikker has been proposed in connection with the "Europlants" project which is to use biotechnology to develop new crops combining the best qualities of existing crops. The project will involve genetic engineering, biochemistry, and plant cell technology.

AS Dansk Gaerings-Industri has been mentioned in connection with the cultivation of plant cells for the production of biochemicals for the pharmaceutical and foodstuffs industries.

Novo Industri AS has been proposed for inclusion in a project for the development of "designer" proteins with fixed biochemical characteristics through the use of advanced computer graphics.

Carlsberg's experimental laboratories' biotechnology department will be involved in the research into the industrial exploitation of high-technology agriculture and animal husbandry.

Per Udsen Aircraft Industry AS is proposed as a partner in projects for new materials, both as manufacturer and as a "test bench" for the materials. The company has also been mentioned in the context of fully automated factory installations under Eureka's "robot" section.

Ferroperm AS has been mentioned in connection with the development and improvement of ceramic materials.

The Riso laboratory will also be involved in the Eureka research into new materials and the research into improving the properties of existing materials.

NKT Elektronik has expressed a strong interest in research into optical systems, including materials research in connection with optical fibers.

The electromagnetic institute at the Technical University of Denmark wants to take part in the research into digital technology, fiber optics, broad band technology, and related fields.

CRI AS has proposed the use of "artificial intelligence" systems in the health sector on an experimental basis. These include decision-making systems, data bases with open access, and training systems within this sector.

Soren T. Lyngso AS has been put forward by the Danish Government in connection with telecommunications, advanced data processing, and computer systems within the industrial sector. The government also points to the company's expertise in the fields of monitoring and control systems for large diesel motors and marine alarm systems.

The Danish Government document, which was drafted with the involvement of the Industry Ministry, stresses that this is only an interim list to indicate that Denmark should have an important role in many Eureka projects. The list is merely preliminary and by no means covers all Danish companies that may be involved in Eureka.

CSO: 5200/2713

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

PRAVDA PUBLISHES GORBACHEV SPEECH THREATENING 'REASSESSMENT'

PRAVDA Version of Speech

PM271306 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jun 85 First Edition pp 1, 2

["Moving Ahead More Quickly: M.S. Gorbachev's Visit to Kiev and Dnepropetrovsk"  
--TASS headline]

[Excerpts] Dnepropetrovsk, 26 Jun (TASS)--M.S. Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, and V.V. Shcherbitskiy, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, arrived from Kiev today in this major industrial center of the Ukraine. They were met at the airport by V.G. Boyko, first secretary of the Dnepropetrovsk Obkom; Y.P. Babich, chairman of the oblispolkom; and other party and soviet leaders of the city and oblast.

Then there was a meeting in the Metallurgists' Palace of Culture between the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the works collective. It was opened by V.F. Marchenko, secretary of the party committee. He gave the floor to M.S. Gorbachev.

The speech by M.S. Gorbachev:

M.S. Gorbachev went on to dwell on foreign policy in his speech. Soviet people, he said, are well aware of the vast efforts being made by our party and government to defend peace and to protect our earth from nuclear calamity. V.I. Lenin once very clearly expressed the principled position of the socialist state when he said: "...We promise the workers and peasants to do everything we can for peace. And we shall do so."

Many years have passed since then. Our people have lived through many bad times; they have had direct experience of the bloodiest wars. With every passing year our state became stronger and mightier. Today it is a great world power, ready to give a fitting rebuff to any aggressor. But today we still promise the workers and peasants, even more firmly than every before, to do everything possible for peace. And we shall do so.

We live at a tense time. You can see that for yourselves. The lives or deaths of hundreds of millions of people, and indeed the destinies of the whole of mankind, depend on whether the warmongers can be stopped.



The question of questions for today is halting the arms race that has swept over the world and the transfer to reducing its accumulated stocks, M.S. Gorbachev stressed. In principle we do not need nuclear and other weaponry in order to build normal relations with the capitalist world if the latter, of course, repudiates aggressive schemes with regard to the USSR and other socialist countries.

We are ready to compete with capitalism exclusively in the area of peaceful constructive activity. For this reason we advocate the development of political dialogue and mutual interaction with capitalist countries, and the wide development of mutually beneficial trade and economic, scientific and technological, and cultural ties. We are ready to develop these ties on a stable long-term basis. But these ought to be honorable, truly mutually beneficial. Ties without any kind of discrimination. For example, to try and use trade for interference in our internal affairs is a hopeless matter. We do not need that kind of trade, we can do without it.

We are prepared to seek accord not only about ending the arms race, but about the greatest of arms reductions -- right up to general and complete disarmament. At present, as you know, we are holding talks with the United States in Geneva. The task before us, as the Soviet leadership understands it, is to end the arms race on earth and prevent one in space. We embarked on the negotiations in order to achieve these aims in practice. But all the indications are that this is precisely what the U.S. Administration and the military-industrial complex which it serves do not want. The attainment of serious accords evidently does not enter into their plans. They are continuing to implement their gigantic program of forcing through the production of more and more new types of weapons of mass destruction in the hope of achieving superiority over the countries of socialism, and dictating their will to them.

The Americans have not only failed to submit any serious proposals in Geneva for curtailing the arms race but, on the contrary, are taking steps which make such a curtailment impossible. I am thinking of the so-called "star wars" program to create a space strike weapon. Talk of its supposed "defensive" nature is, of course, a fairy-tale for the gullible. The idea is to attempt to paralyze the Soviet Union's strategic arms and guarantee the opportunity for an unpunished nuclear strike against our country.

This is the essence of the matter which we cannot fail to take into account. If the Soviet Union is faced with a real threat from space, it will find a way of effectively countering it. Let no one, and I say this quite definitely, doubt this. For the time being one thing is clear, that the American program for the militarization of space plays the role of a blank wall, barring the way to achieving the relevant accords in Geneva.

By its militarist policy the U.S. Administration is taking upon itself a grave responsibility to mankind. I can add that if it were to decide to adopt a more sensible standpoint, it would be a matter of a mutually acceptable agreement on far-reaching and really radical reductions of the stocks of nuclear weapons by both sides. The path would be opened up for totally eliminating these weapons and for removing the threat of nuclear war, about which all peoples on earth dream.

Well, and if our partners at the Geneva talks continue with their line of playing for time at the meetings of the delegations, avoiding a solution of the questions for which they have assembled, and using this time to push ahead with their military programs in space, on the ground and at sea, we shall then of course have to assess the whole situation afresh. We simply cannot allow the talks to be used again to divert attention and to cover up military preparations, whose aim is to secure a U.S. strategic superiority and maintain a line of world dominance. In rebuffing these schemes I am confident that we are supported by the really peace-loving forces throughout the whole world and that we are supported by the Soviet people.

The party Central Committee notes with great satisfaction that our peace-loving foreign policy meets with the complete understanding and approval of the Soviet people. But the main thing is that Soviet people not only approve it, but that they back it up with their actions and their work. And the more successful this work, the richer and stronger our homeland becomes and the more substantial the contribution it makes to the cause of universal peace and the progress of mankind.

Circulated as UN Document

LD101649 Moscow TASS in English 1640 GMT 10 Jul 85

[Text] New York July 10 TASS--A summary of questions of foreign policy from the speech which was made by General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev in Dnepropetrovsk on June 26, has been issued at the UN Headquarters as an official document of the General Assembly. As is noted in the document, the most important question now is termination of the arms race which has swept the world, transition to reduction of the stockpiled armaments.

CSO: 5200/1328

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR: GLOOMY COMMENTS ON RESULTS OF SECOND ROUND

White House Statement Criticized

LD171254 Moscow TASS in English 1229 GMT 16 Jul 85

[Text] Washington July 17 TASS -- TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko reports:

A spokesman for the White House, who announced the completion of the second round of the Soviet-American talks in Geneva on nuclear and space weapons, has made a fresh attempt at distracting the public opinion from the unconstructive stand of the USA at these talks. He claimed that USA showed "flexibility" at the talks, while the Soviet Union demands "unilateral concessions" from the USA.

Yet, it follows even from the statement read out by the spokesman, that the talks are marking time precisely because of the stand of the U.S. delegation. The statement proclaims the readiness of the USA to seek a cut in offensive nuclear weapons, at the same time it is admitted that the USA rejects, as before, every possibility of such an approach to the problem of space weapons that would completely exclude the spread of the arms race to outer space.

The spokesman for the White House was only speculating in vague terms on the readiness of the USA to conduct "detailed talks" to discuss some "limitations" in that field, while the Soviet Union is known to favour a total ban on the use of outer space with military aims.

Even more frank admissions about the reluctance of the USA to opt for precisely such an approach to the problem of space weapons are contained in the recent statement by Max Kampelman, head of the U.S. delegation at the Geneva talks, to a group of Italian MP's in Florence, whose text was issued by the official U.S. Information Agency precisely on the day when the second round of the talks ended.

The American representative lauded to the skies the notorious "Strategic Defence Initiative", which is aimed at creating a large-scale system of anti-ballistic missile defence with space-based elements, by means of which the USA hopes to ensure military-strategic superiority over the Soviet Union. Max Kampelman admitted that the administration is "intensifying" work on the "star wars" programme. Yet, contrary to common sense and facts, he claimed that the programme was a "purely research" one and was in no way in conflict with the ABM treaty. In so doing, he simply disregarded the fact that the Pentagon announced the start of implementation by the USA of a pro-

gramme of laser weapon tests against targets in space, which is a direct violation of the ABM treaty.

Thus, both the statement by the head of the U.S. Delegation at the Geneva talks, and the statement by the spokesman for the White House, are fresh evidence that instead of leading things to the prevention of the use of outer space with militaristic aims, the USA would like to wrest from the Soviet Union consent to drawing up some rules for precisely such a use of space in order to legalise the spread of the arms race to outer space. Meanwhile, the American representatives are trying to picture the principled stand of the Soviet Union, which is firmly determined to avert that lethal danger from mankind, for some "inflexibility" and for a demand for "unilateral concessions" from the USA.

#### Western Press Criticized

LD172349 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 17 Jul 85

[Text] The Western press is continuing to comment widely on the results of the second round of Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons which have ended in Geneva. Over to Aleksandr Druzhinin, political observer of the All-Union Radio and Central Television:

[Druzhinin] Commenting on the state of affairs at the Geneva talks, Western observers are not sparing words. Let's take as an example the well-known commentators Evans and Novak. One's blood literally turns cold over the results of the second round of the talks in Geneva, they write on the pages of the WASHINGTON POST. What is it that has horrified the American journalists so much? It turns out to be the fact that Moscow, as they maintain, has supposedly not made any kind of new proposals at the talks.

It's a strange forgetfulness, isn't it? Is it possible that the USSR's numerous proposals, which create a constructive and businesslike basis for resolving the problems on the Geneva talks' agenda, have disappeared completely from the memories of Evans and Novak, as incidentally, from those of many other Western commentators? We won't enumerate all of the Soviet initiatives, but will merely stop over certain ones. It is well known that it was the USSR which put forward the proposal to ban the use of force in space and from space in the direction of earth. It is also well known that our country proposes that the USSR and the United States of America completely stop work on the creation of new antisatellite facilities and that they destroy the present ones.

But if the Western propagandists do not want to see a sincere wish to work for an improvement in the direction of halting the arms race in these proposals, then one could also remind them about the fact that it was the USSR which declared a unilateral moratorium on placing antisatellite weapons in space and which is calling for a halt to tests on nuclear weapons. It is our country which has taken on itself the pledge to halt the build-up of its response measures, if the deployment of the new American nuclear missiles in Western Europe is stopped.

And how did they react to these steps in Washington? Not one of the Soviet proposals received support from the Washington administration. However, it may be that the United States came out with its own initiative? No, this didn't take place either. The American position remains negative with regard to practically any question connected with halting the arms race. And in this lies the explanation for the lack of progress at the Geneva talks. For the time being the U.S. approach remains as before--to use the talks as a screen for the escalation of its own weapons and for attempts to obtain military superiority over the USSR. Washington is demonstrating this approach sufficiently clearly in forcing through plans for the militarization of space, and in building up its arsenals with the latest nuclear missile weapons. It is understandable that such a position cannot have anything in common with the wish to end the arms race. It also causes growing concern among the world public; in order to delude people with regard to Washington's true intentions, Western propaganda is once more resorting to a crude and premeditated distortion of the Soviet position.

Gorbachev Cited on 'Reassessment'

OW180609 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1045 GMT 17 Jul 85

[From "The World Today" program presented by Vsevolod Shishkovskiy]

[Text] The second round of Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms has ended in Geneva. The course of the discussions shows that the American side still does not wish to follow the spirit of the Soviet-U.S. agreement on the subject and aims of the Geneva talks. As you know, this agreement envisages a mutually linked review and resolving questions on preventing an arms race in space and ending it on Earth.

Washington continues to ignore the numerous Soviet peace proposals and initiatives and continues to implement its "star wars" program; can this promote the success of the talks? It does this despite the sharp public protests on a broad-scale and the frank or veiled disapproval expressed by its Western allies. Even the NOUVELLE ATLANTIQUE bulletin, which has close ties with NATO headquarters in Brussels, was forced to state that the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative of Reagan has become the major problem dividing the Americans and Russians in Geneva.

If we take into account the fact that while holding the Geneva dialogue, the United States continues to turn Western Europe into a first strike staging base and the West Europeans into nuclear hostages, it becomes clear that the American delegation at the talks has no new ideas nor constructive proposals. And most importantly it has no desire to strive for honest and mutually acceptable agreements.

However, the White House, which is building a blank wall in Geneva, should know that the Soviet Union, which remembers the sad experience of previous talks frustrated by the U.S. side, cannot permit, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed, the talks to be used to mislead or cover up military preparations aimed at ensuring the strategic superiority of the United States and its policy of world supremacy.

One hopes that Washington will finally adopt a more reasonable position, will correct its behavior, and will stop dragging its feet. Otherwise the Soviet side will be forced to reassess the entire situation, both at the talks themselves and around them.

## Soviet Deployment Moratorium Recalled

LD182212 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 18 Jul 85

[From "The World Today" program presented by Vsevolod Shiskovskiy]

[Text] Hello, comrades. Over the days there have been quite a few commentaries appearing in the Western press devoted to the second round of Soviet-U.S. negotiations on nuclear and space arms, which has ended in Geneva. Most of these materials point directly to the absence of progress at the negotiations, although all the preconditions for their success were there. [Video shows delegations at negotiations table, with close-up shots of presumably leaders of U.S. and Soviet delegations.]

One must not forget the fact, writes the West German newspaper UNSERE ZEIT, for example, that it is not Moscow, but Washington, who, from the very start of the negotiations, has manifested no readiness for any compromises. The Soviet side, the newspaper stresses, is not only ready to meet its partner in dialogue half-way, but has more than once supported its good will by adopting unilateral steps in the sphere of disarmament.

As is known, the Soviet Union, striving to lighten the search for accords introduced in spring of this year, unilaterally, a moratorium on the deployment of its medium-range missiles and suspended the implementation of other countermeasures in Europe provoked by the siting of new U.S. missiles. Actually, confirming by specific actions its wish to come to an agreement, our country, in connection with the start of the second round, once again turned to the United States with the proposal for an immediate establishment of a moratorium on nuclear and space arms, which would have been an important step in strengthening mutual confidence. The Soviet Union proposed that, in establishing the moratorium, both sides should agree to submit at the negotiations, in the course of a definite period--let's say 1 or 2 months--their specific proposals on all issues under discussion, including the levels to which they would be ready to cut back strategic offensive weapons, with, of course, a ban on strike space arms.

All these steps met with wide support from world progressive public. But what did they reply to them with in the White House? There they continued to stick to a position remote from a desire to search seriously, in a business-like manner, for paths for the achievement of real solutions. Can the continuing siting in Europe of U.S. nuclear death--first-strike missiles--and the tests begun by the Pentagon of various types of space weapons really contribute to successful dialogue?

The White House, under cover of the Geneva dialogue, is increasing preparations for Star Wars and is trying to attach to it their Western allies, as well as continuing their attempts to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union. Is this really an honest approach? Is this really an observance of previous accords on the aims and subject of negotiation? It goes without saying it isn't. This is a very crude violation of them, and open sabotage.

The Soviet Union does not intend to facilitate such a position, which has already been unambiguously stated to Washington. And if there, they do not finally change their unconstructive approach to this important dialogue, the Soviet side will be forced to review its attitudes both to the negotiations themselves as well as the events that surround them.

#### Space Arms Ban Essential

LD190606 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 18 Jul 85

[Text] And now our commentator, Vladimir Teplov, looks at the just ended second round of the Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons:

The round has again shown the U.S. obvious unwillingness to consider the interests of the other side, and achieve an agreement on the basis of equality and equal security. There is an impression that Washington is not going to seriously search for mutually acceptable agreements. This is seen in its insistent attempts to drag the Soviet Union into another stage of the arms race by creating attack space weapons.

The American delegation at the talks has been claiming that if both the United States and the Soviet Union create antimissile defenses with space-based components, it would be easier for them to achieve agreements on dramatic reductions of offensive nuclear weapons. Moreover, this would allegedly make nuclear weapons useless and result in their liquidation. As a matter of fact, the Soviet Union is being invited to participate in (?a) space arms race. Should it reject the offer, it will remain defenseless in the face of the United States, which expects it will get a space shield in 15 to 20 years to protect itself from a retaliatory strike.

If the implementation of the star wars program continues, the Soviet Union will find both economic and technological resources to preserve strategic balance. It will face no other option but to retaliate if the United States starts militarizing outer space in a bid to upset military and strategic parity. A Soviet retaliatory measure, the Soviet Defense Minister Marshal Sokolov has stressed, will concern both defensive and offensive weapons and, of course, the Soviet Union will choose a way of action which meets its defense interests most fully, and not the one Washington would like it to follow.

U.S. leaders should not expect they'll succeed in changing the subject matter of Geneva talks and make the Soviet Union negotiate not the prevention of an arms race in space, but rules for such a race. The Soviet Union favors prohibition of the militarization of outer space. A ban must be introduced on research into and the creation, testing, and deployment of attack space weapons. As for the antisatellite means, both sides must stop creating new such weapons. The means they already have, including those whose tests haven't been completed, are to be scrapped. The Soviet proposals are in line with the agreement the Soviet Union and the United States reached in January that the purpose of Geneva talks should be the prevention of the arms race in space and the stop to it on earth. The Soviet Union continues to honor that agreement, which cannot be said about the United States.

PRAVDA: No Progress

PM201716 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jul 85 First Edition p 4

[Own correspondent B. Dubrovin dispatch: "Geneva: What Hinders Progress?"]

[Text] Geneva, 17 Jul -- The second round of the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space arms has ended here. The Soviet and U.S. delegations are discussing the three questions on the agenda: offensive space arms, strategic offensive weapons, and medium-range nuclear weapons. The joint Soviet-U.S. statement of 8 January this year is the foundation and basis for these new talks, which are being held at the USSR's initiative. It was formulated as a result of the January meeting in Geneva between the USSR foreign minister and the U.S. secretary of state. This document -- I think it is appropriate to recall this once again -- states: "The sides agree that the subject matter of the talks will be the complex of questions concerning space and nuclear arms, strategic and medium-range, and all these questions will be examined and resolved as an interconnected whole."

It is no accident that the words "interconnected whole" appear in the text. Back in January the Soviet and U.S. representatives agreed that the questions of space, strategic nuclear weapons, and medium-range nuclear weapons constitute a single complex and that it is impossible to reach agreement on one of the directions without taking into account or influencing the other two. And the question of the nonmilitarization of space was deemed of paramount importance. You need not be a military specialist to realize the simple truth that the appearance of offensive space arms on the U.S. side would violate the existing military-strategic parity between the USSR and United States, and, naturally, would nullify efforts in the two other directions: the reduction of strategic offensive and medium-range nuclear weapons.

Soon after the January meeting the U.S. secretary of state confirmed in a letter addressed to the USSR Foreign minister that the U.S. Government intends to fulfill the accord reached in Geneva and that it is serious about the commitments adopted under this accord.

Now that the second round is over it is clearly possible to sum up certain preliminary results of the work that has been done and to assess the sides' positions. And, needless to say, one cannot fail to take into account the fact that the talks are discussing extremely complex, fundamental problems that affect in the most direct way the sides' vitally important security interests.

That is probably why it would be incorrect to assess their course and success purely by the criterion of time: how many weeks or months the delegations have spent seeking mutually acceptable solutions. Something else is important.

Has there been progress at the talks, do the sides' positions accord with the prior understanding, and is the time spent around the negotiating table being wasted?

The USSR came to Geneva with the firm intention to hold constructive talks on preventing the militarization of space and on radically reducing strategic nuclear weapons and medium-range missiles. Proceeding on the basis that it is unnatural to hold talks on arms reduction while simultaneously building up arms, the USSR, as is well known, proposed that it and the United States introduce a moratorium on the creation -- inclu-



ding scientific research work -- testing, and deployment of offensive space arms for the duration of the talks. At the same time the quantitative buildup in strategic nuclear arms and the deployment of U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe and the corresponding Soviet retaliatory measures must be stopped.

In order to ease the quest for accords, the USSR unilaterally introduced a moratorium on the deployment of its medium-range missiles as of 7 April this year and halted the implementation of other retaliatory measures in Europe prompted by the deployment of the new U.S. missiles. Reaffirming in practice with specific actions its desire to reach agreement, in connection with the start of the second round the USSR again addressed to the United States a proposal that a moratorium on nuclear and space arms, which would be an important step toward strengthening mutual trust, be immediately established. The USSR proposed that in establishing the moratorium both sides agree that they would submit at the talks within a set period -- say 1-2 months -- their own specific proposals on all the questions under discussion, including the levels to which they would be prepared to reduce strategic offensive arms, naturally, given a ban on offensive space arms.

Thus, the USSR, aware of its responsibility for the fate of peace and the success of the talks, is honestly traveling its part of the road toward reaching agreement in organizing a constructive dialogue and in the quest for a solution to the most important problem of our time.

But talks are a two-way street. Their success depends on reciprocity and on the partner's willingness and readiness to show realism and political will and honorably carry out existing accords. However, at the second round of the talks the U.S. side has been demonstrating an openly obstructionist approach and blocking the achievement of progress. It is believed in local journalistic circles here that during the second round Washington continued to adhere to a position far removed from the desire to seek in a serious and businesslike way ways of achieving realistic solutions.

The unconstructiveness of this position and the U.S. desire to work not toward ending the nuclear arms race but toward building up nuclear arms can be clearly seen both in its negative reaction to the Soviet proposal to freeze the creation of offensive space arms, strategic offensive arms, and medium-range nuclear weapons for the duration of the talks and in its categorical refusal to discuss the nonmilitarization of space.

The point of departure of the talks has been and continues to be the accord reached in Geneva 8 January this year. For instance, it was agreed that the talks would work out decisions on preventing an arms race in space. But it is being noted here that on this cardinal question the U.S. side continues to espouse its old positions. Thus local journalists, citing circles close to the U.S. delegation, are talking about "Washington's firm desire to do everything possible to legitimize the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI], in fact a program for the creation of offensive space weapons."

Evidently with a view to checking "Moscow's reaction," THE NEW YORK TIMES recently launched a trial balloon stating that the Soviet side would agree to accept an arms control treaty while simultaneously allowing the United States to implement work on the "star wars" program.

The Soviet delegation in Geneva described this report as absolutely untrue. Even the U.S. State Department had to deny it.

Nor has there been any change in the U.S. side's position on the other two directions of the talks: strategic offensive arms and medium-range nuclear weapons. The United States tries to justify the continued deployment of its missiles in Europe with false allegations about the imaginary "superiority" of the USSR and is building up its strategic offensive arms. Even though -- and the U.S. Administration is perfectly well aware of this -- the USSR does not have nor has ever had any military superiority in this sphere.

Realizing the shakiness of its positions and seeing the mounting opposition to "star wars" in the world, Washington is trying to convince its NATO allies and international public opinion that nonetheless there has been "some progress" at the talks in these two directions and success would be just around the corner were it not for the USSR's "negative attitude" to the SDI program. That is how local diplomatic and journalistic circles assessed the persistently circulated rumors that "a rapprochement between positions is emerging" at the talks, that there is "tangible progress" on a number of problems, and so forth. Journalists are told: "What do you expect? After all, there have only been two rounds. What are two rounds in talks on such complex problems!"

However, dragging out the talks for many years -- and it is believed here that the Americans are striving to do just that -- is downright sabotage and the most blatant violation of the accord of 8 January this year. The USSR does not intend to promote this position, just as it does not intend to close its eyes to the delaying tactics the U.S. partner has been consciously using. To expect the USSR play into U.S. hands at the negotiating table is an extremely dangerous illusion.

The third round of the talks is scheduled for mid-September. The U.S. side must finally change its unconstructive approach to examination of the questions of nuclear and space arms.

#### USSR Will Not 'Participate in Games'

LD201637 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 20 Jul 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video talk by Vitaliy Kobysh]

[Text] A course of peace, or one of confrontation? Here is a commentary on the U.S. Administration's position at the negotiations aimed at curbing the arms race. The commentary is by Vitaliy Kobysh, the publicist:

Hello, comrades. At the most important talks taking place in Geneva, Stockholm, and Vienna the latest rounds have ended and been adjourned. In many countries parliament has been dissolved for the holiday season.

There is no break, however, in the military preparations of the United States and its NATO allies, nor in the arms race they have unleashed. The situation remains tense, and the results of the aforementioned negotiations have not given any visible results. They have brought no hope of a change for the better.

At the Geneva talks, for example, where key problems concerning the peace and security of the peoples are directly linked, the U.S. delegation is clearly stalling and deliberately shying away from in-depth discussion of the issues, shying away from the main thing -- the quest for accord on the nonmilitarization of space and renunciation of the nuclear arms race.

The impression is created that Washington is preparing to conduct endless negotiations in Geneva. The fact that official U.S. spokesmen have recently been trying hard to prove that there can hardly be success in reaching agreement also draws attention to itself. The same motif can also be heard clearly in connection with the forthcoming meeting, also in Geneva, between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President Reagan at the end of November. A White House spokesman has just announced that the U.S. side, I quote: will not strive to achieve any specific agreement in the realm of arms control.

The question arises: What, then, is the purpose of all these negotiations? Perhaps Washington is just playing a game, one element of which is to prepare public opinion, so that it will not expect anything tangible or constructive from the talks.

Of course, the USSR has no intention of participating in such games. As before, it will seek to ensure that a reliable barrier is placed in the path of the arms race, above all the space and nuclear arms races. We shall not pause in this struggle even for a moment. There will be no summer holidays, no breaks in it.

As for the position and actions of the U.S. authorities, they will be judged both in our country and throughout the world, not by their words about devotion to peace, which are so often uttered in Washington, but by their actual deeds.

PRAVDA: "SDI 'Main Obstacle'"

PM221356 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jul 85 First Edition p 4

[Nikolay Prozhogin untitled international review]

[Excerpt] Problems Awaiting Solution

Among the unresolved problems which perturb broad strata of the international public, the package of questions on the agenda at the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva is highlighted. The second round of these talks ended this week -- and ended without results. The reason was the negative U.S. stance.

Back in January the leaders of the USSR and U.S. foreign policy departments reached agreement that the subject of the new Geneva talks would be the package of problems relating to space and nuclear armaments -- strategic and medium-range -- and that all these questions would be examined and resolved in an interconnected way. It was then that the main aim of the talks was also specified: drafting effective accords aimed at preventing the arms race in space and halting it on earth, limiting and reducing nuclear armaments, and strengthening strategic stability.

The main obstacle erected by the United States on the path to accords is the U.S. "star wars" program. It runs counter to the Soviet-U.S. agreement on the subject and aims of the Geneva talks and to the open-ended treaty concluded between the USSR and the United States on ABM systems limitation.

Seeking to justify their desire to militarize space and to build up nuclear armaments, U.S. officials are misleading the international public. Thus U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz recently accused the USSR of violating the ABM Treaty while U.S. Vice President Bush accused it of continuing to deploy SS-20 missiles. Yet officials of this importance should know the true state of affairs. Our country is not creating offensive space armaments or a wide-scale ABM system, nor is it creating the basis

for defense of this kind. The USSR is strictly keeping to its commitments under the treaty as a whole and in its parts and is unconditionally observing the spirit and letter of this very important document. The USSR also firmly adheres to the moratorium it has announced on the deployment of medium-range nuclear weapons in the European part of the country for the period through November this year and a subsequent decision will depend on whether the United States follows the example it has set.

The motive which has prompted high-ranking U.S. officials to come out at this precise moment with their latest propaganda falsifications is clear: Washington would like to avoid responsibility for the fruitlessness of the Geneva talks.

The U.S. State Department's special statement pursued the same goal. Paul Nitze, the U.S. President's consultant on arms reduction talks, tried to back it up in an interview published in U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT containing many pitiful words about "the Russians' intractability."

Indeed, this interview is also notable in another sense. After P. Nitze dwelled at length and without foundation on the theme of how the United States is ready to agree on all aspects of the subject matter of the Geneva talks, he was asked a direct question: "So you do not rule out the possibility that the United States will agree to conclude a treaty banning the deployment of defense systems based on the 'star wars' concept?"

Pinned to the wall, as they say, P. Nitze reiterated: "We are prepared to discuss all that." But he immediately let slip: "However, we believe that the best way of resolving the problems would be to discuss the question of how both sides are to adopt ABM systems -- if these systems become a reality -- after consultations and after amendments have been made to the ABM Treaty."

This is an eloquent admission. Yes, it is not Moscow but Washington which considers "the best solution" to be the revision of the ABM Treaty in order to sanction the extension of the arms race into space. As for the stipulation "if these systems become a reality," it is designed to lull the public.

The vulnerability of Washington's position is obvious. It is no accident that it is also P. Nitze who complains: "In some circles there is a marked tendency to believe that all responsibility for success or failure rests with the U.S. government and not with the Russians and that Moscow's position is not amenable to change and therefore the blame for the inability to reach agreement rests directly with the United States...This is absolutely wrong, but there is a danger that this viewpoint will gather strength."

Increasingly broad circles of the international public are convinced that the Soviet Union's position at the Geneva talks fully accords with their subject matter and aims and that it has no grounds for altering its position. It is Washington that would like to revise without prior agreement the clauses in the Soviet-U.S. joint statement and the ABM Treaty. That is why the U.S. position is provoking mounting anxiety and indignation in the world. People in the most diverse countries are realizing that the Soviet Union, as it has warned, cannot allow the United States to use the talks again as a decoy, to conceal its military preparations.

The Paris conference this week of a number of West European states which discussed the possibilities for their joint policy and cooperation in the field of sophisticated technology was a kind of reaction to the United States' desire come what may to implement

its program for preparing for "star wars." The relevant project, named "Eureka," was proposed by France, which refused to take part in the elaboration of the U.S. version of "star wars."

As for the Soviet Union, which opposes the militarization of space, it is putting forward a proposal for international cooperation in the peaceful development of space in the interests of all peoples. That this noble cause is entirely realistic is borne out by numerous Soviet space programs, in which other countries, including capitalist countries, have taken part. This is also confirmed by the jointly elaborated and implemented Soyuz-Apollo program, whose 10th anniversary occurred this week. Let us recall that its implementation directly preceded the signing of the Final Act of the All-European Conference in Helsinki.

#### McFarlane Remarks Criticized

PM221053 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Jul 85 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Shifting the Blame"]

[Text] Washington, 21 Jul--R. McFarlane, the President's national security adviser, has resorted to misrepresentation of generally known facts.

Speaking at a White House press conference, he claimed that the second round of the Soviet-American talks in Geneva on nuclear and space arms ended without result because the Soviet Union "maintains its propagandist positions," while the United States is supposedly putting forward constructive proposals.

But it is quite clear even from the context of McFarlane's remarks who approaches the talks seriously and who is only trying to gain time. Thus McFarlane blamed the Soviet Union for the fact that it... firmly follows the Soviet-American accord reached on the eve of the Geneva talks to the effect that during the talks the problems of nuclear and space arms must be examined and resolved in close interconnection with each other. And he passed off the U.S. reluctance to adhere to this accord as evidence of the supposed "flexibility" of the American position. But this "flexibility" is not constructive, but destructive. Its aim is to disorganize the talks process while they step up their own efforts to militarize space. It is the U.S. attempts at all costs to implement the "star wars" program which constitute the biggest obstacle to progress in Geneva. This was admitted, in particular, by former president J. Carter in a West German newspaper interview.

Contrary to obvious logic, the President's national security adviser claimed that the Soviet Union's well known proposals -- on the imposition for the entire period of the talks of a moratorium on the creation, including scientific research work, testing, and deployment of offensive space arms and on a moratorium on any nuclear explosions until the conclusion of a treaty on the general and complete banning of nuclear weapons tests, and other Soviet initiatives -- are supposedly "unfair" to the United States and "not subject to verification." The fact that such claims by Washington have no real foundation is confirmed by prestigious experts, including American experts, who point out that the moratoriums proposed by the Soviet Union would promote the preservation of the existing approximate military-strategic parity between the USSR and the United States, prevent a further buildup of arms arsenals, and promote to a tremendous extent the attainment of accords.

McFarlane's assertions about the "unverifiability" of the observance of moratoriums are also far-fetched. For instance, such an authoritative American public organization as the Center for Defense Information has published a whole series of studies which provide irrefutable evidence that with the present level of technology no nuclear test in any part of the world could go undetected. And specialists at the Washington Institute for Security and Cooperation in Space have demonstrated convincingly that the technical facilities at the disposal of the USSR and the United States make it possible to monitor with the utmost accuracy the observance of an agreement reached.

All this shows that Washington is trying to shift the blame for the lack of progress in Geneva and disguise its own unconstructive stance, which is aimed at blocking efforts in the arms control sphere for the sake of achieving its own aim -- that of acquiring military superiority and pursuing a policy of diktat "from a position of strength."

#### U.S. 'Pessimism' Hit

PM240827 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 24 Jul 85 p 9

[Vitaliy Kobysh "Observer's Opinion": "Operation 'Pessimism'"]

[Text] The latest rounds have ended and a break has been announced at the talks taking place in Geneva, as well as those in Stockholm and Vienna. In many countries parliaments have broken up for the summer recess. Vacation time has come. A time when people can relax and be released from their day-to-day concerns.

But very few people -- in our country or over there, on the other side -- feel free from worry if they pick a newspaper or watch the television news. The situation in the world remains tense. It would be very nice to find reassurance in the results of the aforementioned talks. Alas, they have not yielded any perceptible results or given any hope of changes for the better.

Particular concern is aroused by the fact that at the Geneva talks, where key questions directly concerning peace and the peoples' security are being discussed, the U.S. delegation is obviously stalling and avoiding discussing the crux of the question. It is avoiding the most important thing -- the quest for an agreement on the same nonmilitarization of space and the renunciation of the nuclear arms race.

It is rumored that a big new building is to be built in Geneva for the American delegation. The impression is created that Washington's leaders are planning to hold endless talks there. Or perhaps not endless, but intended to last for the time required for the "star wars" plans to become irreversible. In this connection, it is also noteworthy that official American spokesmen have recently been working hard to prove that the positions of the USSR and the United States at the Geneva talks are so incompatible that there is hardly any chance of reaching an agreement.

The same time can be clearly heard in the remarks of Washington officials concerning the meeting to be held in November, also in Geneva, between M.S. Gorbachev and the U.S. President. A few days ago a White House spokesman spoke frankly of the "comparatively modest aim of the November meeting," and said that the agenda does not include "any concrete agreement in the arms control sphere."

Taken together, all this leads inevitably to the conclusion that people in Washington are not simply expressing doubt as to the success of the current and future talks in

Geneva, but are purposely and deliberately sowing pessimism and lack of faith in the possibility of an agreement which would bar the path of the arms race, especially the nuclear arms race, and its spread into space.

In a word, Operation "Pessimism" is under way, backed up by practical actions which hinder the attainment of an accord. What is the reason for the purpose of this operation?

I think it has three main targets.

First. Extreme right-wing forces, who now set the tone in American politics and to a considerable extent rule both the Congress and the majority of Washington government departments. With their pessimism, the administration's leaders are saying to them, as it were: We do not have in mind anything that you would not like, nor will we make any agreements with the Soviets which would hinder the United States from achieving total military superiority.

Second -- and this is linked very closely with the first -- the U.S. military-industrial complex; those who get rich from the arms race and feed on chauvinism and war hysteria. The corporations which earn their money from war preparations have already obtained unheard-of profits under R. Reagan's administration. But they await the far bigger revenue which is promised by the implementation of the military programs on a frankly insane scale which are planned by the present Washington Administration. Particular hopes are pinned on the "star wars" program, which, according to U.S. estimates, will cost the taxpayers between several hundreds of billions and a trillion dollars. No room for barriers to the militarization of space here!

And lastly, the third target of Operation "Pessimism," the broad masses of the population, the public in the United States and elsewhere. On the one hand it is being instilled into them that there is virtually no chance of success at the talks, and on the other they are blatantly being prepared, so that they regard the failure or even the wrecking of the talks as the result of an "unconstructive" Soviet position.

The question arises: what is the sense of talks if they are condemned to failure in advance? As far as can be judged, Washington sees the sense of it as a kind of game intended to create the impression that, come what may, the U.S. authorities are aware of the seriousness of the prevailing situation and are striving to resolve the most acute problems threatening mankind.

Games are games, and when one side, in this case the Soviet Union, makes constructive proposals, while the other, the United States, is content either to ignore them completely or to reject them out of hand, it all becomes clear. So it is quite clear that no propagandist operations, however purposeful or massive, can obscure the crux of the matter.

We are in favor of improving relations with the United States, but the bridge of mutual understanding and cooperation has to be built from both ends. We are in favor of ensuring that during the discussion of problems on whose resolution the very future of mankind depends, there is no room for games, and that a clear understanding exists that time is merciless: It passes, and wasting it on trying to outwit your partner, in our dramatic age, is tantamount to trying to outwit yourself.

U.S. USSR GENEVA TALKS

PRAVDA ON CONGRESSIONAL FUNDING OF MX, MIDGETMAN, BOMBERS, SDI

PM240903 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Jul 85 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent A. Tolkunov report: "Compliant Legislators"]

[Text] New York, 22 Jul -- The conference committee of the Senate and House of Representatives has approved appropriations for the next fiscal year for a number of major military programs. Hitherto the two chambers of the U.S. Congress had had certain differences on these appropriations.

The legislators set a "ceiling" for the immediate future of no more than 50 MX missiles, each of which will have 10 warheads. For the next fiscal year, \$2.6 billion is allocated to the MX program, including the production of 12 missiles of this type. But observers note that this does not mean that the members of Congress are firmly opposed to the White House's plans to deploy 100 MX missiles; it only indicates differences over options for basing them.

More than \$700 million is appropriated for the development of another ground-based ballistic missile -- the Midgetman -- and more than \$1 billion for the creation of new types of cruise missiles and new strategic bombers.

In the next fiscal year, \$2.75 billion will be spent within the framework of the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative." Although that is less than the sum of \$3.7 billion which the Pentagon asked for, the legislators' decision is being seen here as a victory for the administration. The point is that the conference committee refused to approve the moratorium proposed by the House of Representatives on the testing of antisatellite weapons, a moratorium which, as is well known, has been unilaterally announced and is being carried out by the Soviet Union. In the near future, the United States will carry out at least three such tests. Despite the resistance of many congressmen, a whole series of restrictions on the creation of "star wars" weapons have been lifted.

Although the conference committee made purely symbolic cuts in certain items of the Pentagon budget, the administration, which resorted to stepping up the ballyhoo over the "Soviet threat" and to widely publicized appeals for a "firm show of will" at the Geneva talks, succeeded in "twisting the arms" of the legislators and pushing the planned nuclear and space programs through Congress. It is quite obvious that this course not only blocks the elaboration of constructive accords at the Geneva talks, but violates existing agreements, including the ABM Treaty.

CSO: 5200/1328



U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

TASS COMMENTARY SAYS ROWNY DISTORTS SOVIET PROPOSALS

LD241605 Moscow TASS in English 1554 GMT 24 Jul 85

[Text] Moscow, July 24 TASS -- TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev writes:

Addressing a symposium on national security problems in Sacramento, the capital of California state, general Edward Rowny, advisor to the president and U.S. secretary of state, made an attempt to present in a "popular" form the stands of the sides at the current Soviet-American talks in Geneva on nuclear and space weapons.

The "explanations" by the American general were of an extremely one-sided and tendentious character, obviously in the hope that his audience was uninformed.

Rowny claimed, among other things, that in putting forward the proposal on a cut in the number of the strategic carriers of the sides by 20-25 percent to the equal level of 1,800 units, the Soviet Union allegedly insists that the right be preserved for it to fit out each of its remaining strategic missiles with ten nuclear warheads. On the basis of the version of the Soviet proposals invented by his ownself General Rowny drew the fantastic conclusion that as a result of implementation of the Soviet proposals the number of nuclear warheads in the Soviet strategic carriers was to increase to reach 18 thousand.

Meanwhile, time back when Rowny headed the U.S. delegation in Geneva, the Soviet Union proposed, as the general surely remembers, not at all to increase but to cut to agreed upon equal levels the total number of nuclear charges on strategic delivery vehicles and also to set the number of MIRVed delivery vehicles at a lower level than that envisaged by the SALT-2 treaty. Thus, General Rowny deliberately distorts the Soviet Union's proposals on strategic arms limitation and reduction.

Rowny preferred not to mention in his speech the joint Soviet-U.S. statement of January 8 which says, specifically, that the subject of the negotiations in Geneva will be a complex of questions concerning space and nuclear arms -- both strategic and intermediate range -- with all these questions considered and resolved in their interrelationship. As the Soviet leaders stressed more than once, the reduction of strategic arms is possible, if the arms race in space is not started, if space remains peaceful.

In Sacramento Rowny came out with more fantasies about the state of the anti-missile defence in the USSR and the USA. It follows from his speech that only the Soviet Union now has systems of combatting offensive missiles. As is known, under the 1972 treaty on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile systems and the 1974 protocol to it, the

sides can have not more than 100 anti-missiles in one district. The Soviet Union has never violated that agreement.

The United States preferred time back to create corresponding ABM systems and then to mothball them. These U.S. ABM systems have not at all been destroyed. To deny their existence is the same as to assert that a man who has put his fortune in a bank has not a single cent.

Rowny's speech in Sacramento is a vivid sample of colourful rhetoric now adopted in Washington, the rhetoric aimed at misleading the public opinion about the real essence of the United States obstructionist stand at the present talks in Geneva.

CSO: 5200/1328

U.S.-USSR GENEVA TALKS

USSR GEN CHERVOV: U.S. 'TACTICS OF PROCRASTINATION, BLACKMAIL'

AU121418 Bratislava PRAVDA in Slovak 11 Jul 85 p 6

[Report on a commentary, published by NOVOSTI, by Colonel General Nikolay Chervov, chief of Administration of the Chiefs of Staff of the USSR Armed Forces: "The United States' Obstructionist Stance in Geneva"]

[Text] Moscow--The Soviet NOVOSTI press agency has published a commentary by Colonel General Nikolay Chervov, chief of Administration of the Chiefs of Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, on the current Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space weapons in Geneva.

NOVOSTI opens by stating that the American delegation in Geneva procrastinates at the talks and dodges the solution of substantial issues. The United States at the same time speedily escalates its military preparations and camouflages its unconstructive stance with words about its "readiness" to limit nuclear weapons. Many high-ranking Washington representatives such as George Bush, George Shultz, Paul Nitze, and Max Kampelman at the same time declare that the United States is ready to conduct serious talks in Geneva and to seek positive results. Allegedly, it is the USSR that is blocking a solution of the issues under discussion. Commenting on these claims, Nikolay Chervov says:

I will say outright that declarations such as those made by the aforementioned official representatives of the U.S. administration are meant to deceive the people. The crucial criterion for evaluating the positions of the two sides negotiating in Geneva is, after all, the January agreement between Andrey Gromyko and George Shultz about the subject and the objectives of these talks. How do the USSR and the United States comply with that agreement?

With regard to the key question of the talks--space weapons--the USSR seeks an agreement banning the production, development, and deployment of offensive space devices. This agreement would also provide for the destruction of already existing antisatellite systems in the USSR and the United States, the testing of which has not yet ended. This Soviet position is fully commensurate with the January agreement on preventing an arms race in space. Preventing means vis-a-vis outer space so that no offensive weapons appear there. This is exactly what the USSR strives for.

The Soviet Union has proposed to the United States to agree--while completely banning offensive space weapons--on a radical limitation of strategic weapons and on a ban on the production, development and deployment of new types and systems of these weapons; that is, on completely halting the arms race in the area of strategic devices.

As far as intermediate-range nuclear weapons on Europe are concerned, the USSR seeks their limitation to a minimal level, a level to be determined on the basis of the principle of equality and equal security of the countries of NATO and the Warsaw Pact with the aim of ridding Europe of all nuclear weapons, both intermediate-range and tactical.

The objectives pursued by the Soviet Union at the Geneva talks are thus clear: They are the expeditious adoption of measures aimed at reaching an agreement on preventing an arms race in space and terminating it on earth, the accomplishment of a radical limitation of strategic weapons and of intermediate-range nuclear weapons in Europe, and the reinforcement of strategic stability. Reaching these objectives is no easy task; it encompasses complicated questions in three areas--space weapons, strategic weapons, and intermediate-range nuclear devices. To fulfill these tasks it is necessary, first and foremost to halt the arms race.

That is why the USSR has proposed the introduction of a moratorium on nuclear and space weapons as soon as possible. This would prevent the arms race from being carried into space and would halt the growth of strategic arsenals as well as the further deployment of nuclear devices in Europe. This step would not be complicated at all; it is an absolutely realistic measure that would not require any lengthy talks and which could be adopted in the most immediate future. This moratorium would be a necessary element that would even in the present stage contribute to the talks' progress.

However, the United States has no wish to conduct serious negotiations and no interest in implementing in practice the agreement reached by A. Gromyko and C. Shultz on 8 January. Official representatives in Washington declare that the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative is not subject to negotiations and will be implemented irrespective of the course of the Geneva talks. In lieu of an agreement the American side proposes just some sort of rules that would regulate the arms race in space. It is evident that this approach to the problems completely contravenes the objectives formulated in the agreement of January.

In the sphere of nuclear weapons, the United States continues to propagate its old proposals, tabled previously at the talks on limiting nuclear weapons in Europe and on limiting and reducing strategic weapons. These proposals do not lead to any limitation, but to the continuation of the arms race.

Concerning strategic weapons, for example, leading U.S. representatives frequently speak about their readiness to radically limit these weapons. Yet the gist of their position is completely different. It amounts to an arms build-up. The United States speaks about its readiness to limit the number of warheads of intercontinental ballistic missiles and of submarine-based strategic guided missiles to 5,000 units, yet at the same time it is planning

to deploy 20 cruise missiles on each of 400 heavy bombers. This "limitation" thus provides for the deployment of 8,000 cruise missiles by the United States. In addition, the United States is planning to deploy 5,000 cruise missiles on naval and land bases. When we add up all these numbers, we reach the conclusion that the American "limitation" assumes the form of a gigantic arms build-up--18,000 nuclear warheads on strategic carriers.

[AU121419] As regards intermediate-range nuclear devices in Europe, the United States is not proposing anything new. It is the same "zero" and "interim" options which, as was said in Washington some time ago, are not meant at all to reach an agreement with the USSR.

Such are the positions of the USSR and the United States at the talks in Geneva. Who then is blocking the talks? The answer is unequivocal--the United States. Its entire stance is oriented not at preventing and terminating the arms race, but at escalating it. The White House would like to blame the Soviet Union for the cul-d-sac in Geneva. This aim is to be served, specifically, by the mendacious statements on the Geneva talks that have been made by U.S. Vice President George Bush, Secretary of State George Shultz, and others.

The attempt of the U.S. administration to use in Geneva the same tactics of procrastination and blackmail which it used during the previous talks on limiting nuclear arms in Europe and on limiting and reducing strategic weapons (1981 to 1983) does not have now, just as it did not have then, any chance of success.

CSO: 5200/1328

HUNGARY: PROGRESS MAY DEPEND ON U.S.-USSR SUMMIT

LD211133 Budapest Domestic Service in Hungarian 0610 GMT 21 Jul 85

[From the 'Seven Days on Five Continents' program]

[Text] [Unidentified announcer] Optimistic American statements and rightly cautious Soviet newspaper opinions followed the conclusion of the second round of the Soviet-American arms limitation talks in Geneva. I asked Istvan Kulcsar: Did the chance of agreement actually increase or decrease in this round?

[Kulcsar] I must respond by saying that there are two sides. On the one side, we must realize that two rounds have already taken place without anything of substance having occurred. This does not give reason for special optimism. However, on the other side, it can be said that the summit meeting is approaching, and it can be expected to a certain extent and very cautiously that some progress might occur there, since the issues at hand are such that a decision must really be reached at the highest level.

[Announcer] So, can it be concluded from the statements thus far that the next round of talks will possibly not even be resumed until then, and impetus for emerging from the deadlock is being awaited at the summit meeting?

[Kulcsar] In any case, they will be resumed formally on 19 September, exactly 2 months before the summit. However, we will see whether anything will happen in this third round.

[Announcer] Are they at the same place they started regarding every issue, or have new proposals appeared since the start?

[Kulcsar] There have been new proposals but no trace of progress precisely because the issues are interwoven. For example, the USSR has said that if there is progress on the issue of preventing the militarization of space, then it will be willing to agree to reduce its number of strategic nuclear weapons, their delivery vehicles and, supposedly, their warheads by some 25 percent. However, the United States is presently unwilling to listening to any type of compromise at all regarding the issue of space weapons.

[Announcer] It emerged, when the Soviet-American summit meeting was announced not long ago, that a topic of discussion will be what is being discussed at Geneva.

[Kulcsar] Probably the main topic.

[Announcer] And what will the others be?

[Kulcsar] There is no preliminary agreement concerning this. Preparation for the summit is now in progress.

[Announcer] Might Reagan's illness affect the summit?

[Kulcsar] In principle, yes; in practice, at least, it appears on the basis of present American reports that in the autumn the President of the United States will be capable physically, mentally, and from every viewpoint of undertaking such a journey and such discussions, which are, in any event, physically strenuous.

SPACE ARMS

JPRS-TAC-85-028  
6 September 1985

TASS ON SDI DISCUSSION AT UPCOMING NATO ASSEMBLY SESSION

LD101043 Moscow TASS in English 1026 GMT 10 Aug 85

[Text] Washington, August 10 TASS -- Ronald Reagan's "star wars" project is the major topic of a five-day debate at the North Atlantic assembly's session to be held in San Francisco in autumn, says a press release for foreign journalists, issued by the U.S. Information Agency.

More than 200 members of parliaments and legislative assemblies of all NATO member countries are expected to attend the session. The press release admits the possibility of differences flaring up at the session even among Washington's closest allies during the consideration of the White House's decision to set up a large-scale anti-missile defence system in outer space.

Lieutenant-General James Abrahamson, head of the Pentagon's Strategic Defence Initiative organization, Kenneth Adelman, director of the government's Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, other highly-placed officials in the administration and the Department of Defence of the United States will be sent to San Francisco to try and brainwash the Western Europeans into accepting the "star wars" plan.

CSO: 5200/1364

SPACE ARMS

IZVESTIYA LINKS SPACE SHUTTLE WITH SDI TESTING

PM081419 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Aug 85 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Landing Made by 'Challenger'"]

[Text] New York, 7 Aug -- The U.S. space shuttle Challenger has made a landing at Edwards Air Force Base (California) with seven astronauts on board.

This flight was proclaimed by NASA to be an exclusively scientific expedition. However, local observers point out that this time, too, the expedition involved carrying out an experiment which is of great significance for implementing the U.S. Administration's proclaimed "star wars" program, aimed at the militarization of space. In particular, the ship-maneuvering motors were started up to study the "corridors" which occur in the ionosphere as a result of the influence of the motors' exhaust products.

As stressed in this connection by AVIATION WEEK & SPACE TECHNOLOGY -- a journal close to the Pentagon -- space plasma research was carried out within the framework of the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative," whose aim is to create a large-scale ABM defense system with space-based elements. The weekly points out that, at the instigation of U.S. Defense Department specialists, the influence of atmospheric plasma on the operation of lasers and beam weapons in space and the possibility of using the latter effectively for tracking and destroying missiles were carefully studied.

On the admission of official representatives of the space control center, the crew only fulfilled about 80 percent of the planned program during the 8 days in space. This was due primarily to faults in one of the ship's three main motors, which almost led to an emergency landing. In addition, the fine-guidance instrument system was seriously upset, which prevented a number of astronomical observations from being carried out.

CSO: 5200/1364



SPACE ARMS

PRAVDA COMMENTARY ON EUROPEAN DOUBTS OVER SDI

Moscow APN DAILY REVIEW in English 11 Jul 85 pp 1-6

[Article by G. Vorontsov: "Contrary to Vital Interests: Western Europe and the Arms Race"]

[Text] Europe, like the whole world, is now going through a difficult period of time. The arms race, escalated by the aggressive imperialist quarters, their efforts to break the military-strategic parity and to push mankind to a nuclear holocaust caused increasing anxiety of the peoples. The task of breaking the vicious circle: confrontation-arms race-confrontation, is ever more becoming top priority on the agenda. The Soviet Union, all countries of the socialist community time and again demonstrate their sincere interest in lessening tensions and in attaining practical results in the disarmament sphere.

But evidently neither the United States nor NATO, despite their peaceable rhetoric, intend to reduce the rate of the material preparations for war. The exceptionally important decision of the USSR to set a moratorium on the deployment of its medium-range missiles and to halt the implementation of other reply measures in Europe was hurriedly declared by the official Washington to be "propaganda." Such hasty reaction was meant to a considerable extent for Washington's confederates in NATO because many of them had received the Soviet initiative with interest and viewed it as a positive move creating a favourable climate for the Geneva talks.

Many facts show that the sentiments in favour of a search for ways to strengthen security through talks are mounting not only among the public but also in the government circles of the West European states. Evidence of this is also the growth of the apprehensions which are being voiced in Western Europe in connection with the demands by the American "hawks" to renounce the observance of the provisions of the SALT-2 Treaty which limit the arms race. Grave concern on this score was expressed also at the latest NATO Council session held in Portugal last June. Certain differences on other questions were also observed at the session. Spain refused to sign the final document altogether while Denmark and Greece did not agree with one of its major items which speaks about the "necessity" of continuing to deploy the American medium-range missiles in Europe.

Adopting the "missile decision" in 1979 and beginning to put it into practice in 1983, the United States and NATO linked with it their hopes to gain superiority over the USSR and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation as a whole. The consent of the West European states to deployment of American missiles was explained of course not only by Washington's pressure but also by the class interest in ensuring "effective confrontation" with the socialist countries, as well as by the hope for the strengthening of the notorious American "nuclear guarantees."

But shortly afterwards it became clear that the plans were at variance with reality. The USSR's reply measures, aimed at neutralising the NATO "missile decision," graphically showed the illusory character of the stake on gaining military supremacy. As for the hopes of some West European politicians for a "hardening" of the so-called American "nuclear umbrella," they proved to be futile because the Pentagon's strategy developed with due account primarily for the selfish interests of U.S. imperialism--to protect, as far as possible, the U.S. territory against nuclear conflagration, "limiting" it to Europe.

The U.S. and NATO officials made no small efforts to create the impression that the "strategic unity of the allies has strengthened." But even such advocate of Atlantic solidarity as former U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger has to admit that in the main the West Europeans regard the American missiles as a host regards an undesirable guest.

In effect, the United States is making amendments in one of the basic postulates of the NATO strategy--the postulate on "indivisibility" of the NATO defences, in keeping with which an attack against the European allies is considered to be tantamount to an attack against the United States. But in actual fact the NATO "nuclear defence" system has a tendency to a "rupture" because the United States does not make it a secret that it would like to limit a conflict to the Old World. Such sentiments have become more definite now, in the 1980's, under the present U.S. administration.

The bellicose character of the Washington policy manifests itself also in its continuous demands that the West European states intensify their participation in the NATO military preparations. There is a deluge of threats from overseas to the "negligent" partners, though they have increased their military spending by 44 percent since 1970. Yielding to the United States' pressure, the allies ever more find themselves in the captivity of the arms race which has been gaining speed. Chemical and neutron weapons and other types of armaments are to follow the "Euromissiles."

Even the most obedient partners of the United States more than once expressed doubts in the expediency of some or other initiatives of Washington in the arms race sphere. The attempts of the United States to stuff outer space with weapons and to involve the U.S. allies in the implementation of its so-called "strategic defence initiative" (SDI) have caused a special response in recent time. The West Europeans regarded the American "star wars" plans in different ways. While the NATO aggressive and military quarters expressed their full support for them, broad masses of the population declared themselves in no uncertain terms to be against them.

Notes of alarm over the prospects of the transfer of the arms race into space have been voiced at various levels in all West European states. In particular, French minister of external relations R. Dumas has openly said that the SDI "leads to a super arms buildup which the militarization of space would certainly be and, consequently, to an increased risk and danger," and that "it does not promote security." British Foreign Secretary Geoffrey Howe has warned about the danger of destabilization of the international situation and of a further intensification of the arms race in case of the implementation of the SDI.

Having run into such strong opposition, Washington has once again resorted to the tactic of persuasion, pressure and arm twisting. U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger has persistently offered his NATO colleagues to take part in the work under the SDI program.

The ruling circles of the West European countries have found themselves in front of a complex dilemma. On the one hand, there is such a thing as "Atlantic discipline," but on the other it is clear enough to everybody that the space adventures of the Pentagon cannot possibly strengthen their security. The ultimatum set by Washington in March this year has failed to produce the desired results. Greece, Denmark and France have openly refused to participate in the Star Wars program. Even such loyal U.S. allies as West Germany and Britain, despite their initial support of the American plans, have started having second thoughts. As a result, in the final communique of the June session of the NATO Council the Star Wars program was not even mentioned at all.

There are equally serious differences within NATO as regards the attitude to the prospects of Soviet-American talks in Geneva. Whereas among the West Europeans, despite all the differences and subtleties which exist in the wide spectrum of political forces there, there is a growing interest in constructive and meaningful dialogue, in real arms limitation and disarmament and in preventing the militarization of space, the United States believes that Washington's opinion must be a rule for everybody else. Not surprisingly, in his letter to the seven members of the West European Union who were just about to discuss the problems of disarmament and space at their latest session, U.S. Assistant Secretary of State R. Burt demanded that they should not work out any common approach to arms control outside the NATO framework.

But then Washington obviously believes that talks can well be accompanied by a hectic arms buildup. There is a growing impression that to suit the military industrial complex the U.S. administration has no intention of working for the agreed-upon goals of these talks which are the termination of the arms race on earth and the prevention of its spillover into space. The American side has not as yet made a single serious arms-control proposal in Geneva. On the contrary, Washington is undertaking steps which make such control utterly impossible. Its Star Wars program and the plans to militarize space have become a veritable brick wall in the way of positive agreements in Geneva.

As it has been authoritatively stated by its leaders, the Soviet Union simply cannot allow the talks to be used once again as a distraction to cover up the

continued military preparations. Mikhail Gorbachev has noted, in particular, that "if our partners at the Geneva talks carry on with their line, marking time at sessions, evading the settlement of the issues for the sake of which they gathered there in the first place, and using that time for stepping up their military programs in space, on the ground and on the seas, then of course we will have to reassess the situation."

The people in West European countries, both in broad public circles and in many government offices, are looking with mounting anxiety at the stubborn continuation of Washington's militarist course which can push Western Europe towards nuclear catastrophe, and it is only natural that this course encounters mounting opposition there.

Broad public circles on both sides of the Atlantic are increasingly speaking up for the revival of detente whose foundation was laid 10 years ago at the All-European Conference in Helsinki and which opens real prospects for peace and security.

(PRAVDA, 11 July. In full.)

CSO: 5200/1353

SPACE ARMS

MOSCOW TO JAPAN: JAPANESE 'TACIT SUPPORT' OF SDI

OW081051 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 7 Aug 85

[Unattributed commentary: "On Japan Being Drawn Into the U.S. Space Militarization Program"]

[Text] MAINICHI SHIMBUN on August reported that late this month the Japanese Government will send a team of experts to the United States to seek detailed information about the "star wars" plan. In mid-September Japan will make a final decision on the issue of its participation in this dangerous plan.

The Japanese Government has so far avoided taking a clear-cut position on this issue, while using various pretexts and asserting that the space militarization program requires further study. Frankly speaking, however, it should be clear to everyone with common sense that the deployment of arms in space only further enhances the threat of war. There is no need for any new study about this fact.

While the Japanese Government is doing what it calls a study of its response to SDI, the Strategic Defense Initiative, Japan has virtually been dragged into preparations for the implementation of the "star wars" plan. Things have gone so far that parts of the so-called SDI (?elements) are being deployed to Japan. It has been disclosed that the Pentagon has been making preparations to equip F-15 fighter-bombers stationed at Kadena with ASAT's, antisatellite missiles.

Among the U.S. allies, Japan was one of the first to be invited by Washington to take part in the formulation and implementation of the "star wars" program. There were reasons for it. As NIHON KEIZAI SHIMBUN wrote recently, the Pentagon has a special interest in Japanese research and high technology, particularly in high technology with potential military application. Incidentally, this concern should be regarded as a move prompted by specific intentions.

Earlier this year, the Pentagon sent the Japanese Government, after a careful study, a long list of technologies it wants transferred to the United States. It should be noted that all these technologies are intended for use in preparing for the "star wars" program. In the near future the U.S. Government plans to formally ask Japan to give it detailed information needed for the development of fifth-generation computers.

Private Japanese firms are also taking part in the preparations for space militarization. For instance, according to recent revelations, a U.S. branch of Hitachi Metals, Ltd. has provided a powerful magnet for use as part of space laser weapons. This has been anticipated, because the Japanese Government had officially stated that

it does not intend to bar private companies from participating in the development and production of space weapons.

All these objective facts make one feel that the forthcoming Washington visit of the Japanese expert team will very well prove to be an excuse for the Japanese Government to shift from tacit approval to positive support in Japan's participation in the Pentagon's space adventure.

CSO: 5200/1364

SPACE ARMS

IZVESTIYA SEES PEACEFUL, MILITARY APPLICATIONS FOR EUREKA

PM121300 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Aug 85 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Yu. Kovelenco "Pertinent Notes": "Debates Over 'Eureka'"]

[Text] Paris -- As has already been reported, a recent conference held in Paris approved in principle the project christened "Eureka." This project envisages the organization of cooperation among the West European countries in the development of the latest technologies, including space technology. Taking part in the conference were the ministers of foreign affairs and scientific research from the 12 EEC countries, including its new members, Spain and Portugal, as well as Austria, Norway, Finland, Sweden, Switzerland, and representatives of the European commission.

On the eve of the meeting, Paris sent all of the participants a "white paper" entitled "The Technological Rebirth of Europe" containing 24 programs in the sphere of computer science, microelectronics, the use of lasers, biotechnology, and so forth. Judging by appearances, these will form the basis of "Eureka."

Addressing the conference, French President F. Mitterrand stated that the main aim of "Eureka" is to "ensure Europe's technological independence in vitally important spheres." He announced that France will allocate Fr1 billion for the implementation of various programs within the "Eureka" framework in 1986.

The idea for the "Eureka" project was put forward 3 months ago by President F. Mitterrand after U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger issued an ultimatum that the allies reply within 2 months to Washington's proposal that they participate in the U.S. plans for "star wars." Paris, as is well known, refused, and the newspaper L'UNITE, the organ of the ruling socialist party, wrote recently that "Eureka" is a reaction to the so-called U.S. "Strategic Defensive Initiative" (SDI). However, French officials have repeatedly stressed that "Eureka" should not be seen as a "counterproject" aimed against SDI. France put forward this proposal, they stress, because it believes that the West Europeans can only compete with the United States and Japan in developing the latest technology by pooling their efforts and acting jointly. Paris also wished to hinder to a certain extent the participation of French companies in the U.S. "star wars" program; prevent West Europe being turned into Pentagon subcontractors; and ward off a "brain drain" overseas.

It is being pointed out on the Seine that "Eureka" will encompass a number of individual peaceful projects utilizing progressive technology. But at the same time, it is recognized that the results achieved may also be used in the military sphere.

As yet, there has been no final agreement among the states participating in the conference on questions of cooperation within the framework of the proposed project. But a number of West European firms, including Thomson of France, Philips of the Netherlands, Siemens of West Germany, GEC of Britain, and others, have already stated their intention to participate in "Eureka".

Washington is pressuring French companies closely linked with U.S. capital. But it is an open secret that it would like to include "eureka" in the U.S. plans for the militarization of peace. It was no accident that General J. Abrahamson, the leader of the organization for the implementation of SDI, stressed the "compatibility" of his brainchild with the "Eureka" project. And even in Paris people are talking about the possibility of "bridges and contacts" and "common technological roots" existing between them.

"Eureka" faces considerable difficulties in getting off to a successful start. These are linked not least with funding for the projects and longstanding contradictions within the Common Market. The FRG government, although now supporting "Eureka", has not stipulated any corresponding allocations in its state budget. Observers are saying that each of the countries participating in "Eureka" is trying to use its various programs for its own interests. The main lines of the project remain extremely vague.

During the Paris conference various viewpoints came to light on a whole number of questions, specifically the structure of the coordinating organs which will implement the program; the choice of projects; the forms of cooperation; means of financing; and so forth. All of these questions will be examined at the next meeting devoted to "Eureka," which will be held this fall in West Germany.

Concern is being voiced here that in the future, under the influence of U.S. pressure, "Eureka" may turn into some kind of "European version" of the U.S. program for the creation of space offensive arms. Thus, in connection with the recent Paris session of the Franco-West German joint commission for security questions, whose members are ranking representatives of the two countries' foreign and defense ministries, the influential weekly L'EXPRESS wrote: "Paris and Bonn have taken the first step along the road toward a West European project for 'star wars' preparations."

The other day J. Isnard, a LE MONDE military observer close to the authorities, told his readers that by the end of the century the French army must be "tuned in" to space. That is why it is impossible to rule out the chance that the first steps that are being taken over "Eureka," which was initially conceived for organizing a "technological Europe," may in time undergo the most unexpected transformation.

CSO: 5200/1364



SPACE ARMS

## EUROPEANS MOVE TOWARD CONCERTED EFFORT ON EUREKA PROJECT

### Matra, Norsk Data Agreement

Paris L'HUMANITE in French 25 Jun 85 p 9

[Article by Julien Pierre]

[Text] The French group Matra signs an agreement with Norsk Data as part of space militarization.

Matra and Norsk Data have just signed in Oslo the first European contract of the Eureka program. It concerns the joint construction of a supercomputer. On the other hand, agreements between Bull and Siemens, and between Cilas (CGE) and Selenia, could also be concluded. In FRG, the government has just given its official approval to Eureka. As the Milan summit draws near, Europe, led by France, increases its participation in Reagan's military-industrial projects.

Several days before the European summit in Milan, Matra and Norsk Data, a Norwegian company, announced the signing of the first European contract as part of the Eureka program. The agreement covers the joint construction of a compact vector computer. This supercomputer should see the light of day in three years.

Matra's presence among the first two European signers of a contract under the Eureka umbrella, is particularly significant. J.-L. Lagardere, Matra's CEO, has been congratulating himself ever since the beginning of the Eureka program, as well as of the American Star Wars (IDS) program. He was even one of the first to openly acknowledge the "complementarity" of the French government's Eureka program and Reagan's IDS, during a press conference held at the Bourget Salon.

At the signing of the agreement with Norsk Data, he in fact continued to deny any conflict between the two programs, and illustrated in his way what Francois Mitterand himself had indicated by declaring that "bridges and paths could be laid between Eureka and IDS." He indeed disclosed that "companies on the other side of the Atlantic, specialized in artificial intelligence, are

already interested in our vector computer." And everyone knows that artificial intelligence is one of the technical fields involved in Star Wars, thus being abundantly sprinkled by the \$26 billion which President Reagan intends to allocate to this program over a five-year period, even if it means that the drain on Europe and the third world will be increased.

It is equally interesting to note that Matra and Norsk Data have already been partners since October 1984, and that in this guise, they will soon introduce a microcomputer, which appears to be no more than a simple adaptation of Norsk Data's ND 500 super minicomputer. Will the Norwegian company's domination be as strong in the agreement that has just been signed? In any case, the race for the Eureka and IDS markets does not open for our country the path to greater technologic power, as it would appear from the official speech.

In fact, as the Milan summit comes closer, we are seeing renewed pressure to draw Europe more deeply into the IDS wake. Fascinated by the enormous amounts which Reagan intends to commit to this business, the appetites of American and French companies are becoming sharper. In France and Europe, the directors of these companies are increasingly taking the position that it would be crazy to bypass these juicy markets. In this light, Francois Mitterand's initiative appears more clearly as what it is: a means to organize European participation in Reagan's military projects.

The military aspect is now acknowledged even in official declarations. Present at the signing of the Matra-Norsk Data contract, H. Curien, minister of research, declared this about Eureka's financing: "The government devotes 10 billion francs per year to the fields covered by Eureka. It will continue to concentrate these resources on this program in two ways: financial aid, and the opening of public--eventually military--markets."

Other agreements could occur quite rapidly as part of Eureka, maybe even at the Milan summit. There is talk of a Bull-Siemens agreement on very high power computers, and of another one between Cilas, a CGE subsidiary, and the Italian company Selenia, on industrial lasers. The government and the French company are thus rushing headlong into a frantic armaments race led by Reagan.

#### Electronics Giants Favorable

Paris LE MONDE in French 27 Jun 85 p 8

[Article by Eric le Boucher]

[Text] Eureka is beginning to very seriously interest the industry. After Matra and the Norwegian company Norsk Data, which at the end of last week agreed to cooperate on vector computers (LE MONDE of 22 June), Europe's four largest electronic companies have published a joint statement of intention, favorable to the initiative started by Mr Mitterand two months ago for technologic Europe.

Netherland's Philips, Germany's Siemens, France's Thomson, and Great-Britain's General Electric (GEC), "consider that the Eureka program must mobilize the European research potential on a small number of projects designed to encourage the development of equipment and systems likely to find both civilian and military commercial outlets and applications." They will examine the various aspects of the planned cooperation and will commit themselves "within the six months following a decision from the governments to launch Eureka."

For these companies, future markets depend on "strategic components" on which the effort must be focused, which will be advanced microprocessors (called Europrocessors), fast integrated circuits and gallium arsenide, microwave components, high-density memories, flat panel displays, and "sensors" of all types.

On the eve of the 29 [as published] and 29 June Milan summit, the reinforcement provided by these four leaders is significant. In electronics, Philips, Siemens, Thomson, and GEC represent cumulated revenues of nearly \$35 billion, and a share of 12 percent of the world's military electronics market, 9.6 percent of the components, and over 14 percent of all consumer goods (TV, HIFI, and so on).

These companies are actually not the only ones interested in Eureka. In Milan, Mr Mitterand should be distributing to his colleagues a White Paper about the program, prepared in Paris by CESTA (Center for the Study of Advanced Systems and Technologies), which will contain a list of existing inter-industrial collaboration projects. These projects cover about a dozen topics, which range from vector computers to seeds, with insulin pumps and power lasers in between. All in all, dozens of European companies have already reacted and are ready to participate.

"Show me!" is the clear message they are sending to the governments. They hope that the latter will not stop at intentions but will move fast, given Europe's delay and the need for urgent decisions. "Show me!" But only as long as the projects are finalized (ending up in products), financing is available (no reassignment of appropriations that are already committed), and the structures of organizations to be established in Milan are not bureaucratic.

Once the topics have been disclosed, the manufacturers are known, and the structures are defined, there remains the question of money. The feeling in Paris is that public appropriations will be needed for a "fast start." Bonn appears to be of the same opinion. But after that, nothing prevents bankers from participating in the financing of these projects, since they must rapidly end up in commercial income. The British and the Germans, it is said in Paris, are very favorably inclined toward the participation of banking or any other private money in technologic Europe.

Two months after its launching by Mr Mitterand, Eureka seems to be a real, and frankly unexpected success. It is as if in their hearts, the European manufacturers were waiting only for an initiative, a trigger such as this. They must not be disillusioned in Milan.

11023

CSO: 3698/558

SPACE ARMS

FRENCH DEFENSE MINISTER ON EUREKA

DW221247 Cologne Deutschlandfunk Network in German 0900 GMT 21 Jul 85

[Interview with Defense Minister Claude Hernu by correspondent Baukhage; questions in German, answers in French with superimposed German translation; date and place not given -- recorded]

[Excerpts]

[Baukhage] Mr Minister, I would like to discuss the aspect of outer space defense. We are faced with the fact that space technology is the technology for tomorrow's security systems. The question is whether France by itself can send an observation or navigation satellite into space. Can it construct its own antimissile system?

[Hernu] We do not want to do this alone. It would be better if there were European cooperation in this field.

[Baukhage] Also in connection with antimissile systems?

[Hernu] France is already working alone on antimissile systems. We are also about to improve the effectiveness of our weapons, such as by launching a new nuclear submarine, the Inflexible. We have hardened our missile installation near Albion; we have a new missile, the M-4; and we are working on a future missile. However, we would like to cooperate, and you touch on another problem in this connection, the problem of a shield.

[Baukhage, interrupting] The European shield?

[Hernu] For the time being, the United States speaks of the U.S. shield. General Abrahamson, the chief of the SDI program, or Edward Teller, themselves say that they do not know yet whether in the year 2005 or 2010 this system will guarantee the security of the United States by 70 or 90 percent. I have told them: Even 90 percent would be grave because if 10 percent would get through, it would mean that 1,000 missiles of the adversary would drop on the United States. I am a man who deals with the protective shield, but who knows that the sword will probably dominate.

[Baukhage] Alain Broch, your compatriot, suggested creating a protective European shield. What do you think of that?

[Hernu] I myself am for European cooperation, for viewing the military problems. However, I would like to point out that the military dimension of space has nothing to do with the Eureka problem. Eureka is a civil program. SDI is a military program, and Eureka is not the European answer to SDI. I would say that even if SDI had not existed, Eureka would have to be created in the civil sector. It is a good thing that research and studies may exist in the military field. However, I am not quite certain

whether it will be possible in the immediate future. To get back to your original question, I am of the opinion that it would be good if a coordinated answer of Europe existed, because we, the French, do not take part in SDI.

If these new technological efforts, such as the Eureka project did not exist on a European level, it would be most regrettable. However, I say that in such a case, France would have to do it along with great financial sacrifices, to maintain its place in the world. I stress it because we are capable to do it, and because we have the necessary technologies.

Naturally, I know that in the military field it would make us face a difficult financial problem. Therefore, I prefer cooperation with other European countries. However, I am adding that France would have to go this way along if cooperation were impossible. Therefore, I have created in my ministry military space research a group, consisting of scientists and military representatives. We are about to explore everything that would permit France to see better, to reconnoiter better, and to have better communications via satellite.

I would like to add that a military satellite will be of great usefulness when we will achieve disarmament, as I hope. In order to see and control the disarmament of the superpowers, it is better if we, France and the FRG, have our own satellites without just blindly trusting the others.

[Baukhage] Mr Minister, I thank you for this talk.

CSO: 5200/2712

SPACE ARMS

FRG DEFENSE MINISTER WELCOMES WEAPONS PROPOSALS

LD221741 Hamburg DPA in German 1046 GMT 22 Jul 85

[Text] Saarbruecken, 22 Jul (DPA) -- Defense Minister Manfred Woerner (CDU) has welcomed the proposal from his French counterpart Hernu to cooperate in Europe in the area of space weapons. Woerner said in an interview with Saarland Radio on Monday that such cooperation is "certainly desirable." He considers Hernu's proposal an interesting thought which will have to be carefully examined.

Woerner said that one day the Europeans will most certainly have to develop defensive systems for the sphere of short-range weapons. This applies both to ballistic systems and to the cruise missile. However, Woerner drew attention to the fact that such a project demands considerable financial outlay and is technologically very ambitious. Therefore, he can imagine that there could be European-U.S. cooperation alongside very close European cooperation. "For it could very well be that the Europeans alone do not have the finances and the appropriate technology," the minister said.

On possible European cooperation in the area of missile defense against long-range missiles, Woerner said that he does not think that Europe possesses the strength, the financial means and the technology to develop her own defense systems against strategic weapons in competition with the United States. One has to seek cooperation with the United States in this area.

CSO: 5200/2712

SPACE ARMS

FRG MINISTER ON FUNDING, INDUSTRY UNDER EUREKA

DW222143 Hamburg ARD Television Network in German 2000 GMT 19 Jul 85

[Interview with Minister of Research and Technology Heinz Riesenhuber, by reporter Guenter von Lojewski -- recorded; date, place not given]

[Excerpts] [Lojewski] According to the will of its fathers, Eureka is to ensure Europe's technological competitiveness world-wide, increase social and economic prosperity, and guarantee jobs. Are these not big words for a program which so far has not been defined regarding its substance or organization?

[Riesenhuber] It is a challenge with a view to the direction in which we are to work. We are to find new technologies that allow us to achieve this. New technologies that advance us on the markets create jobs. New jobs help us resolve our problems. We will have to find out which high-technology projects within Eureka we can develop better through cooperation than through individual efforts.

[Lojewski] In what way should a project be organized?

[Riesenhuber] In principle, an enterprise that is competent in a particular field should be responsible and find partners in other countries, and the states should jointly examine whether they can support this project.

[Lojewski] Does your budget envisage the money, or has the finance minister promised that you will get money for this?

[Riesenhuber] I have enough money for 1986 to be able to finance the development and definition of projects. However, then we will probably be faced with bigger tasks. Then we will have to discuss additional funds. Next year is not decisive; we will be able to handle that. In subsequent years, we will discuss larger amounts, possibly also entirely different fields -- environmental protection, industrial waste disposal, or high-speed railway projects.

[Lojewski] In view of the fact that industries are expected to make considerable investments, do you really think you will find interested partners?

[Riesenhuber] If we do not find them, nothing that the state can organize will help. Only if industry considers market-oriented Eureka projects as being its own task will we have a chance to fully supply the growing and integrating European market with European technology. The state cannot organize this.

[Lojewski] Is it not much less risky and much easier for FRG industry to orient itself with the U.S. SDI program, for example, where hundreds of billions of dollars are offered by the state?

[Riesenhuber] Industry will have to decide for itself. However, it will have to consider the future development of markets and the demand for military technologies on the one hand and civil technologies on the other. The question of whether it will stake its technological capabilities on the development of large and growing markets or on a military demand is a decision on principle. For those who have so far been successful in the civil markets this is a challenge that they essentially proceed from. In addition, Eureka is a big chance for European industries to cooperate and compete, as well as for the states to intensify the industries' energy and strengthen them.

[Lojewski] Do you not anticipate a French preponderance in this entire program, in other words, the FRG acting as financiers of jobs that will then be created in other states?

[Riesenhuber] This depends decisively on the commitment of our industry. I think we have capabilities in many of the fields mentioned, as well as in entirely different areas that are discussed under the label "biotechnology." The decisive point will be for the industry to recognize projects and for us to help it develop them; the decisive point for the industry will also be to find partners in other countries and to develop these projects with a high degree of flexibility based on responsibility. Then there will be no preponderance of one state but a growing partnership cooperation in a stronger Europe.

[Lojewski] With 16 partners it will be more difficult than within the EC alone, as experience has shown.

[Riesenhuber] Not all partners will cooperate in all projects. However, all partners are to find partners for individual projects.

CSO: 5200/2712



SPACE ARMS

NETHERLANDS PAPER PERCEIVES PITFALLS FOR EUREKA SCHEME

PM221245 Amsterdam DE VOLKSKRANT in Dutch 19 Jul 85 p 3

[Editorial: "Eureka"]

[Text] Eureka, old Archimedes' cry of joy, is now the formula for technological cooperation in Europe that has been accepted by 17 nations. This cooperation is undoubtedly necessary, but whether Eureka is such a lucky find for the EEC is open to question.

Technological cooperation is becoming more a matter for national states and industries and thus less a motor for European integration. Eureka could even lead to a slow breakup of the EEC, because cooperation on technological development threatens to become a matter for countries which have power, money, and know-how. Poorer countries with less well developed industries and less expertise could easily opt out.

The fact that the European Commission will proceed further with its proposals for a technological community is poor consolation.

Because the European heads of state and government were unable to make a clear choice between the French Eureka project and the wide-ranging proposals of the Commission a couple of weeks ago in Milan, they gave both plans their blessing. The result is that Europe now has two cooperation projects involving primarily the same countries and covering the same technological fields.

Whether the technological community, if it comes about, and Eureka, for which the starting signal was given in Paris yesterday, really will complement and reinforce each other as the optimists contend is highly uncertain. The scarce funds can only be used once. It is therefore more probable that Eureka and the technological community will become rivals.

And because the Eureka project will probably pay the member nations poorly for the projects from which their own industries will profit, these countries will be very greatly tempted to make a thriftier contribution to the EEC. The European commission has pointed out that a technological community will require not less, but considerably more money.

The attitude of the Dutch Government remains vague. The EEC is of the greatest importance to the Dutch economy. It seems unwise for this reason that the Hague has avoided a clear choice and is advocating a link between Eureka and a technological community which in practice will probably not work.

The French idea behind Eureka--to ensure Europe's independence in the technological field especially now that the United States is after European know-how through its star wars program--is undoubtedly correct. But it is a pity that Paris wants to keep Eureka outside the EEC as much as possible.

The argument that bureaucracy must be avoided and that the system must be able to function supplely is quite understandable at first sight. But it still has to be proved that 17 European nations are quicker and more efficient than the--admittedly--slow-moving community of the ten, soon to be the twelve. Experience teaches that the problems begin with the concrete realization of good ideas.

CSO: 3698/593

SPACE ARMS

SPANISH ARTICLE ANALYZES EUREKA, SDI IMPLICATIONS

PM221327 Madrid EL PAIS in Spanish 14 Jul 85 pp. 24-25

[Carlos Gomez article: "The U.S. Friend's Technological Challenge"]

[Excerpts] Madrid -- According to official sources, the government is convinced that Eureka and "star wars," even assuming that they succeed in achieving only a part of the ambitious goals which they have set themselves, will change the world radically over the next decade and that to stay outside them is the surest way to be absorbed by the Third World. Nor is the government unaware that joining in these projects does not in itself guarantee Spain's access to the technologies of the 21st century. Hitherto, Spanish participation in multinational technological developments, in much less ambitious and sophisticated projects than Eureka or the SDI, has been confined traditionally to subcontracting the simplest parts of the products (bodywork, assembly, wiring) to enterprises in our country, for a turnover which in only a few instances offsets our financial contribution to them.

According to Ministry of Industry sources, the technological standard of Spanish enterprises will make our participation in many of the SDI and Eureka programs impossible, and access to other programs will necessarily have to involve coordinating and bringing together the enterprises operating in the same sector, and even signing agreements with similar enterprises in other countries, such as Italy or Belgium, or with the leading multinationals. According to these sources, if we do not act in this way, the returns on our contribution to the financing of the two projects could again be zero in technology and be confined to the sale of oranges and shoes, hotel bookings, the assembly of chassis, and bodywork.

According to government sources, Spain, which is technologically over 20 years behind its already badly lagging European partners, literally risks being absorbed by the Third World in this game. To say outside Eureka and "star wars" means falling into the pit of underdevelopment in the near future. However, to take part in the two projects does not guarantee, either, that we will be able to escape such an unwanted fate, and will mean diverting substantial financial resources, essential at a time of acute crisis, into fields of uncertain short-term profitability and zero impact on unemployment.

Felipe Gonzalez has weighed these cards -- which, as can be seen, are none too attractive -- and has decided that it is better not to stay out of this game imposed on us. In principle, Spain will take part in both projects and will attempt to gain the greatest possible advantage from some rather mediocre cards. The Ministry of Industry has already drawn up a list of the enterprises with some prospect of taking part in some small part of some of the many projects, and a philosophy of promoting technological development, inconceivable a few years ago has now been introduced.

According to Director General for Innovation and Technological Development Florencio Ornia, our advanced technology enterprises are manufacturing small articulated arms -- almost prototypes -- while in Eureka a third-generation of robotics is already being considered. Tiny lasers are being manufactured in Spain while in "star wars" they intend to link earth with space. There is a lack of telecommunications engineers and computer science technicians, not to mention great minds, although there is a host of unemployed university graduates in other subjects. There are no managers for these high technology enterprises, which in their financial or labor dimensions, the qualifications of their personnel, the size of their markets, and the rapid obsolescence of their products have little or nothing to do with traditional industry or commercial enterprises. Neither through vocation or scientific tradition, or the size of our market do we have any chance of creating high technology outside international cooperation. We are very weak, Ornia added, and we have no research or industrial infrastructure for access to the scientific fields proposed by the SDI and Eureka, "but entry into the EEC, the challenge to competitiveness which it entails, and the invitation to take part in joint technological development projects with other, more advanced countries opens up to us a wide range of possibilities."

The problem centers on the terms of entry into these programs. Because of the opportunities it creates for taking part in the formulation of its specific programs and because of the offer of involvement in the development of patents and not just in the development of products, Eureka is foremost the program offering our country better prospects. However, participation in "star wars" must not be disdained, either, especially because of the U.S. multinationals established in Spain (which will probably be unable to take part in the European project).

"Our weakness leads us to start from scratch," Ornia stated, "and to select very carefully in which programs we take part and to what we commit ourselves. Technologies and not products must be chosen." Assistance, Ornia said, should be granted by considering primarily the projects' technological importance more than their profitability. In this world of high technology, the director general asserted, the enterprises are very small, and it does not matter that many of them are constantly disappearing if the qualifications of their personnel and their technologies make possible the immediate setting up of other, new enterprises.

To this end the state will force through financial assistance for research the merger and coordination of enterprises in order to avoid pointless duplication and competition, and their linkage with small enterprises in other countries in order to undertake and share out a specific field of research in the international programs. Angel Luis Gonzalo, chairman of the Association of Telecommunications Engineers, adds that it is also necessary to change immediately our scientific and technical structures, which are not the right structures to enable Spain to take part in major international programs.

Luis Solana, chairman of Telefonica and its industrial group, which is the Spanish holding company in the best position to join in some Eureka and "star wars" projects, emphasizes that the challenge posed lies in the incorporation of all the advanced telecommunication technologies and in the know-how acquired only by involving our industries in projects in which skills can be learned. "The best technology that can be found in the multinationals must be brought to Spain, and major applied research plans must be launched by the government to serve as a driving force for the development of these technologies." In Solana's opinion, the SDI and Eureka projects "will teach us how to research and cooperate," and in this connection he asserted that it is imperative that we opt for the U.S. model of an overseeing agency or for the European model that creates an entity as the main contracting enterprise in order to tackle our participation in both multinational projects in a coordinated manner.

Jose Antonio Perez Nieva, chairman of Ceselsa, which is probably the only Spanish enterprise that can compete internationally, with its own technology in aircraft radar systems and simulators, also complains about the lack of telecommunications engineers (they are being sought even outside Spain), and is quite certain that in order to take part in multinational projects it is necessary to have some experience in the development of the projects proposed.

CSO: 5200/2712

SPACE ARMS

#### BRIEFS

NO FRG FUNDS FOR SDI, EUREKA--Bonn, 9 Jul--Research Minister Heinz Riesenhuber (CDU) does not have the funds in his 1986 budget for the European technological cooperation project (Eureka) that has been proposed by France. Riesenhuber said that his funds were "fully spoken for." If greater amounts are needed for Eureka in 1986, the finance minister must allocate additional funds, he said. According to Riesenhuber, the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) does not threaten to place a burden on his budget. This project "is not" included in the Research Ministry's budget, he stressed. The minister objected to the charge by the SPD opposition in the Bundestag that he has restricted his financial leeway to too great a degree by participating in expensive space research programs, such as the Ariane V. booster and the U.S. space shuttle, Columbus. [Excerpt] [Frankfurt/Main FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU in German 10 Jul 85 p 6 DW]

CSO: 3698/573

SALT/START ISSUES

MOSCOW HITS U.S., CLAIMS OF SOVIET SALT VIOLATIONS

Krasnoyarsk Radar

LD071920 Moscow World Service in English 1610 GMT 7 Aug 85

[From "The Way We See It" program]

[Text] Mr (Joe Summers), of (Belmore), New Jersey, United States, asks: Does the Soviet Union have a space defense?

The reply is provided by Vladimir Kozyakov of our staff, and here's what he writes:

The Soviet Union does not have a space-based antiballistic missile defense system, and this was recently officially stated yet again by Soviet Marshal Akhromeyev. Whenever U.S. representatives try to accuse the USSR of creating such a system and violating the treaty on limiting antiballistic missile defense systems, they only come out with general declarations or resort to crude falsifications. For instance, the U.S. side is speculating on the issue of the Soviet radar station being erected in the vicinity of the city of Krasnoyarsk. A concocted argument was projected alleging that it's a station for an early warning of missile attacks, and for that reason should not be located in the Krasnoyarsk area, but on the periphery of the Soviet Union's territory and with outward orientation, something that's required by Article 6 of the ABM Treaty. But in reality that station has nothing in common with the system for an early warning of missile attack. The station is intended solely for tracking objects in space, and the United States side was told that time and again.

The United States accuses the Soviet Union of testing for antimissile purposes [word indistinct] the ABM defense systems that are allowed. Through such allegations official Washington is trying to prove that the USSR, in violation of the treaty, is getting ready to create an ABM defense system covering all its territory. But these allegations have repeatedly been refuted. So why then is the United States so persistently trying to accuse the Soviet Union of all kinds of sins and, in these attempts, is ready to resort to crude falsifications?

The men in Washington need slander against the USSR so as to shield their own plans for setting up a wide-scale antiballistic missile defense system with elements of space-basing. It's precisely the United States that's taken the overt line of undermining the understandings reached earlier. U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger has stated that if the United States research proves the possibility of setting up an up-to-date defense system with elements of space-basing, the ABM treaty will have to be circumvented and reviewed.

In a document, submitted by the Soviet Embassy to the U.S. State Department in February 1985, it was pointed out that the United States has long taken a line of undermining the 1972 treaty signed for all times. That document is regarded as an obstacle by the politicians who aspire to militarize space in an attempt to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union and ensure a first-strike potential, a shield from under which it would be possible to deal a nuclear strike.

The United States is already testing space weapon components; for instance, in June, during the flight of the space shuttle Discovery. New systems of antimissile defense are being tested that involve the use of a special warhead on two stages of the Minuteman ballistic missile. In violation of the treaty, the United States is working to develop mobile ABM defense system radar stations which is forbidden by the above-mentioned document.

The list of violations could go on and on, and all these are real facts, unlike the groundless accusations that U.S. representatives are making against the Soviet Union.

### 'Smokescreen' for Buildup

LD102232 Moscow TASS in English 1512 GMT 10 Aug 85

[Text] Washington, August 10 TASS -- "From the early days of the Cold War until today, exaggerated fears about Soviet nuclear weapons programs have played a central role in securing public and congressional support for U.S. military buildups," says the DEFENSE MONITOR published by the Center for Defense Information.

"Because official estimates of Soviet military forces have been widely inflated, U.S. nuclear programs far in excess of what is needed for the defense of the United States are too often approved." In this connection the authors recall the "bomber gap" scare of the mid-1950s. Using that pretext the United States amassed an awesome bomber fleet of 1,854 planes by 1959, THE DEFENSE MONITOR says.

Raising an outcry over an alleged "missile gap" the United States embarked on a buildup resulting in the deployment of 834 intercontinental ballistic missiles as early as in 1964.

At the present time, the bulletin says, we see a new scare campaign. Newspaper columnists, congressional conservatives and administration officials have claimed that the Soviet Union is on the verge of a massive "breakout" on all fronts. To "support" these allegations reference is made to "U.S. intelligence services." THE DEFENSE MONITOR writes in this connection that the data which reach the public are "worst case" assessments, leaked for political purposes.

In actual fact, it follows from the pronouncements made by U.S. generals, they know well that there are no "violations" of any kind by the Soviet Union of its obligations under treaties. For instance, General John A. Wickham, Jr, Army chief of staff, said in 1984 that "the Soviets are remaining within the limits" of the treaty on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile systems. In his turn General Charles A. Gabriel, Air Force chief of staff, said that the Soviet Union has "pretty well stuck to the numbers requirements in SALT I and II."

The data cited in the DEFENSE MONITOR are another authoritative proof of the fact that the Reagan administration's campaign of intimidating the public with "the Soviet military threat" is a smoke-screen behind which Washington carries out a relentless global military superiority.



SALT/START ISSUES

TASS CRITICIZES U.S. PAVE PAWS RADAR

Violates AMB Treaty

LD140545 Moscow TASS in English 0525 GMT 14 Aug 85

[Text] Washington, August 14 TASS -- The United States Space Command has announced the establishment of the 9th missile battery to be fitted out with a large Pave Paws type radar that can be used for anti-missile defence, reports the newspaper AEROSPACE DAILY.

The construction of the radar facility is being carried out at the U.S. Air Base of Robins, Georgia. The new unit will be integrated in the first space wing of the Air Force.

The construction of Pave Paws Stations will enable the Pentagon to create a radar network covering a large part of U.S. territory.

Once it is fully implemented, the programme will directly violate that U.S. pledges under the ABM treaty limiting anti-missile defences.

'Star Wars' Role Seen

LD142033 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1345 GMT 14 Aug 85

[Text] Washington, 14 Aug (TASS) -- The Space Command of the U.S. Air Force has announced that it will set up yet another combat unit equipped with a large Pave Paws type radar station with a phased antenna, reports AEROSPACE DAILY. The commander of the new unit, which is to be part of the first space wing the Air Force is setting up, is to be John (Tayer), who until recently commanded one of the first Pave Paws radar stations, deployed at the Beale Air Force Base in California.

Building stations of the Pave Paws type, whose tactical and technical characteristics have been brought up to the level of antimissile defense radar stations, will enable the Pentagon, bypassing the obligations assumed by the United States under the treaty on the limitation of antimissile defense systems, to set up a radar field covering a large part of U.S. territory. Two radar stations of this type are already in operation on the western and eastern seaboard of the United States, and the construction of two more is under way in the south.

Contrary to the provisions of the treaty on the limitation of antimissile defense systems, construction is also under way of a large Pave Paws radar station far outside U.S. territory in Greenland. Under the cover of false verbose statements by the White House about carrying out so-called "harmless research" within the framework of Reagan's "star wars" program, the Pentagon is pushing through the implementation of plans to militarize space. The vast majority of American citizens condemn these plans of Washington. As was shown by an opinion poll carried out jointly by the newspaper THE WASHINGTON POST and ABC television, 53 percent of those asked were opposed to the preparations for "star wars." The opposition of Americans to this program will become even greater when it becomes clear that the realization of the "star wars" program could lead to the violation or rejection of the 1972 U.S.-USSR treaty on the limitation of antimissile defense systems. In this case, 74 percent of those in the poll would refuse to support it.

CSO: 5200/1362

SALT/START ISSUES

SOVIET ARMY PAPER LAMPOONS U.S. SALT II VIOLATION CHARGES

Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Jul 85 p 4

[Article by Col I. Nikolayev under the rubric: "Feature Article": "The Branching Cranberry"]

[Text], A few days ago, the director of the Central Intelligence Agency sent for his chief specialist on Russia. There was a conversation, the shorthand record of which is presented to the reader with, in a manner of speaking, the accuracy of a feature article. The abbreviations used are: D.--director, and S.--specialist.

D. I sent for you to give you some extremely unpleasant news. A group of senators, including the ardent opponents of the SALT II agreement Symms, McClure, Helms, East and others, has a knife at our throats demanding details on Soviet "violations" of the provisions of this as well as other agreements. You know these people and how they hang on to something. We have a rough time ahead of us.

You understand that our agency faces a double danger in preparing such information: if we "reveal" new "violations," then they will accuse us of not reporting on them in time. And if we repeat ourselves, they will say that we are resorting to worn-out myths again. Therefore, we need to think of some universal or, at the very least, semiuniversal version to project credibly and explain effectively any actions of the Russians. Naturally, to depict in one direction: they are violating, violating and once violating some more! Shall we give it a try?

S. (thoughtfully) I do have an idea.... We must utilize an expression that is rather well-known in Russia but absolutely unknown in the West: "the branching cranberry."

D. And what is that?

S. My assistants found an explanation of this expression in a dictionary of the Russian language, whose author is a certain Ozhegov. In it, a "branching cranberry" is interpreted as a designation of something absolutely improbable, the discovery of the complete unfamiliarity with something.

D. Well, how can this help us?

S. Let me explain, sir. Without going into the meaning and linguistic details, we can use the newspapers and magazines under our control to publicize the "scientific" information that the Soviet Agricultural Academy has developed a new variety of branching cranberry with an absolutely fantastic branching capacity. In addition, this tremendous plant does not let any radio waves through, that is, its crown provides an impenetrable barrier to radar.

D. So..., what then?

S. It is then quite simple: the cunning Russians use this variety of branching cranberry for military purposes, namely, to provide absolutely reliable camouflage of all of their armaments--both old and new in particular--that is, for a significantly more effective camouflage than we had for the "Minuteman" shafts. At the same time, we can explain convincingly why our glorious organization was somewhat slow in revealing violations and was not very confident about their authenticity, and we can demonstrate the difficulties that our "cloaked champions" are encountering in Russia and....

D. Enough! I understand that very well myself. They are all thumbs and are liable to get caught at the absolute worst time. If it is not Stombauch getting into trouble, then it is somebody else....

S. ...The branching cranberry can be that panacea that you have long dreamed of, sir! I suppose that you will be able will to use it to "substantiate" the version about the Russians' development of various missiles of the most up-to-date types. And in the future, we will report that the Russians have planted the branching cranberry along the shores of the Pacific and Arctic Oceans and have, under cover of this plant, constructed and put into operation an entire fleet of the most up-to-date aircraft carriers.

D. That may be premature. Overall, however, the idea is good.

S. Can we begin carrying out the operation? We can call it by the code name "Branching Cranberry."

D. Take it easy! The idea is too good to waste on minor things. When we have to prepare a report to Congress with an evaluation of the direct and indirect military consequences of "violations" of all bilateral and multilateral agreements by the Soviet Union, then we will go ahead with it. By the way, this may be needed as early as 15 July. In the meantime, what do you have besides the "cranberry"?

S. Unfortunately, sir, just the usual "bull": spreading rumors that even the latest Pentagon brochure, "Soviet Military Power", undercounted 1,970 to 1980 warheads on the Russian side, for example, and 293 to 296 new missiles have already been deployed....

D. I well remember your recommendations to give "unrounded" figures. That seems to lend authenticity to any information. This time, however, let us dispense with this method and round off the figures: 2,000 warheads and 300 missiles! And as for operation "Branching Cranberry," keep it in our active file. It is our gold mine!

9746

CSO: 5200:1315

## INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

USSR: EUROMISSILES, SDI UNDERMINE 1970 USSR-FRG TREATY

PRAVDA Commentary

[no sourceline given]

[Ye. Grigoryev commentary: "USSR-FRG: Tested Foundation; On the 15th Anniversary of the Moscow Treaty"]

[Excerpts] In the relatively short but not uneventful history of Soviet-West German relations, which dates back 3 decades, there is no more important date than 12 August 1970. On that day the treaty between the USSR and the FRG was ceremoniously signed. It was fated to become an important milestone and to be fully implemented.

The treaty signed in Moscow was the offspring of detente. But in its turn, it gave a powerful stimulus to that noble process. The development which it began ended with the creation of a whole system of treaties and agreements. They include the FRG's treaties with Poland, the GDR, and Czechoslovakia. The West Berlin problem was settled by the four-power agreement between the USSR, the United States, Britain, and France. In the fall of 1973 the two independent and sovereign German states, the GDR and the FRG, were admitted to the United Nations.

Prominent FRG figures have repeatedly noted that the normalization of relations with the socialist countries has helped to strengthen the country's equality and sovereignty. While remaining within the system of coordinates defined by its membership in Western alliances, the FRG has gained the opportunity to participate more independently and actively in international efforts aimed at ensuring security and cooperation in Europe and throughout the world. In the seventies it made use of these opportunities and made a constructive contribution to the cause of detente.

But in the recent period, other emphases have begun to prevail markedly in Bonn's foreign policy line. People on the Rhine have attached themselves to the Washington and NATO course of achieving military superiority and undermining the strategic balance in Europe and the world. Despite the solemn pledges, which are repeated from time to time, to exclude forever the possibility of aggression being unleashed from German soil, the siting of American first-strike nuclear missile weapons on West German territory, targeted at the Soviet Union and its allies, was permitted.

As a result the danger of war in Europe was intensified. Within the framework of this policy, West Germany has seen a new manifestation, causing serious alarm to the peoples, of activeness among those evil forces which have not drawn the proper conclusions from the lessons of the last war.

Concern must be aroused by the approving stance on the part of responsible circles in the FRG with regard to the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative," which, in effect is a program for the creation of space offensive weapons and the militarization of space. Judging from a West German Foreign Ministry spokesman's statement, the American line on the question of nuclear tests, which envisages continuing them, was also automatically supported on the Rhine. As for the Soviet proposal for a moratorium and the ending of any nuclear explosions, which is welcomed by all the reasonable world, people there declare tendentiously that it "does not offer ways of resolving this problem."

It is obvious that the aforementioned facts do not in any way fit in with the interests of ending the arms race and strengthening European and universal security. And all this cannot but have a negative effect on the political climate of Soviet-West German relations.

Here it is apposite to recall the circumstances of the Moscow treaty's birth. Of course, in the main it was predetermined by the logic and irreversible realities of all postwar development. But it is also true that its preparation was an extremely difficult and responsible task. It was necessary to clear away huge barriers of alienation, distrust, and prejudice. In order to draw a line under the bloody past, achieve a turn toward normalization and good-neighborliness, and secure the necessary accords, it was necessary to display not only good will, but political courage, realism, and farsightedness. In a sense this experience retains its universal significance today, when mankind's highest interests require an innovative view of today's problems and a bold approach to the resolution of the cardinal tasks of preventing the militarization of space and ending the arms race on earth. It reminds us of the possibility of settling the most complex international questions. Especially the questions which arise in Soviet-West German relations.

One would like to hope that a sober approach to the problems of European and international security will prevail in FRG policy. This presupposes above all respect for each other's security interests and corresponding cooperation, not confrontation on these vitally important questions. Today there is a broad field of activity and real opportunities for strengthening peace, taking into account the constructive proposals and major acts of good will by the USSR, including its unilateral moratorium, now in effect, on the deployment of medium-range missiles and other countermeasures in Europe.

The concrete Soviet proposals on a question of such concern to the FRG as medium-range missiles are well-known. Here the USSR is prepared to go a very long way. Our aim is complete parity in the European zone in terms of the number of missiles and warheads on them, a zero level between the USSR and the United States [Nasha tsel -- polnyy paritet v yevropeyskoy zone po chislu raket i boyegolovok na nikh, nulevoy uroven mezhdru SSSR i SSHA]. Our country is also prepared to move toward ridding the European continent entirely of nuclear (medium-range and tactical) and also chemical weapons. In all these matters the FRG could objectively display the spirit of partnership which arises from the Moscow treaty; take concrete steps on its side to overcome the dangerously increased nuclear confrontation; and make a positive contribution to the cause of peace in Europe.

An appeal for such efforts is often made by the West German public. The energetic activity of the antiwar and antimissile movement and the desire of a broad strata of the FRG population for peaceful cooperation arouses a warm response and respect among Soviet people.

We highly value the fact that the vast majority of West Germans reject the imposed transformation of their country into a U.S. nuclear missile bridgehead; share the noble, peaceful aims of the Moscow treaty; and regard it as the cornerstone of good neighborliness and mutually advantageous cooperation with the Soviet Union. This attitude is expressed well by W. Brandt, whose signature is on the Moscow treaty: "Despite all the difficulties of world politics, the treaty has justified itself as a factor for stability and for cooperation, which guarantees peace. Even those who were once opposed to it have stopped calling it into question. It works..."

Today, the Soviet Union is in favor of its relations with the FRG developing on an upward line in the political, economic, cultural, and other spheres, in favor of the use of the accumulated experience of these mutually useful ties. Whatever the existing problems and the degree of their complexity, our peoples, who live in the same European home, like all other peoples, cannot but have a coincidence of interests in the most important thing, to achieve an end to the arms race, eliminate the threat of nuclear catastrophe, and ensure peace, security, and cooperation in Europe. The Moscow treaty, which remains the tried and tested basis of Soviet-West German relations, works toward this end. It calls for, and makes incumbent, action against any encroachments on the basic foundations of peace in Europe and the utilization of every opportunity to improve the situation on the continent and ensure a peaceful future for the peoples.

#### CPSU Official in FRG Paper

DW090707 Hamburg DIE ZEIT in German 9 Aug 85 p 4

[Article by Nikolay Portugalov, CPSU Central Committee staff employee: "Bonn Lives Off the Capital Alone"]

[Excerpts] The conclusion of the Moscow treaty [between the FRG and the USSR on 12 August 1970] represented an historic act without which all of the following important steps along the road to detente would have been inconceivable: the Quadripartite Agreement on West Berlin; the Federal Republic's so-called treaties with the East on the normalization of relations with Poland, the GDR, and other socialist countries; and the Helsinki conference, this culminating point of detente in the seventies, whose 10th anniversary was just celebrated.

For the first time in all of the FRG's history, the Moscow treaty offered to the FRG the opportunity to turn from being an object to a subject of international relations and to promote in all fields its own national interests within the framework of the Western alliance (the FRG's membership in this alliance has never been questioned); interests that have not always agreed in every respect with the interests of the United States, the leading power of this alliance. It can certainly be said that not until the signing and ratification of the Moscow treaty did the FRG turn from a military appendix of NATO into a fully qualified member of the Western alliance where it is in a position, just as France and England, to pursue its own national policies.



In the seventies, Soviet-FRG relations, which had almost fallen victim to decades of fruitless confrontation, have become, in conformity, with the degree to which the Moscow treaty has been filled with life, a model of good-neighborhood between highly developed systems. Today the further implementation of the basically inexhaustible potential of the Moscow treaty is confronted by considerable difficulties. This is a result of the fact that the transition from political to military detente has unfortunately not been achieved. This was not the fault of the Soviet Union. In the late seventies and early eighties, the United States, supported by the major NATO countries, withdrew its recognition of principles related to equality and equal security in relations between East and West (the first Soviet-American agreements on arms limitation had been achieved as a result of this recognition). Once again the United States embarked on a course through which it is striving for unilateral strategic advantages and, in the long run, worldwide hegemony.

The FRG has fully and unreservedly supported this course of the U.S. Government, and has thereby violated the letter and spirit of the Moscow treaty and called into question the fundamental political philosophy that I have mentioned here.

Why is the FRG embarking on this dangerous road although everyone can see that any participation in SDI would cause the FRG to become a "zone of continuous unequal and limited security" for good, a position that is by no means enviable? The current FRG leadership's possible motives for such actions elicit increasing concern in the Soviet Union, where it is considered possible that the FRG's military-industrial complex, which is growing stronger all the time (above all in the so-called "Bavarian California"), is trying to impose its will on the country's political leadership. By participating in the development of offensive space weapons as well as of "smart" conventional weapons systems, the FRG's military-industrial complex wants to bypass the "nuclear stage," and turn West Germany into a military superpower that would possess strategic weapons and could raise claims to revising the results of the war.

This analysis is supported by what we see as an obviously increasing revanchist mentality in the FRG's political life. This holds true, above all, for the right-wing of the CDU/CSU government party. A large number of West German conservatives have apparently in no way reconciled themselves to the social-liberal coalition's Ostpolitik, against which they fought for 14 years. Today they are again denying that the Moscow treaty is legally binding on the FRG in the area of the recognition of the inviolability of borders and the territorial integrity of all European states. In addition, in their speeches and writings certain CDU and CSU politicians dwell on the subject of a "new European order," in which there would be no room for the GDR and for socialism in the East European countries. If this is not revanchism, then I do not know what this term means.

The Moscow treaty is not, of course, being called into question by these alarming symptoms in the FRG's policy. As before, it forms the basis of Soviet-FRG relations. Statements by the FRG's political leadership to the effect that there is continuity in Ostpolitik and that Bonn's foreign policy in general is predictable are being noted in the Soviet Union. However, a situation has developed that makes it difficult to fill the Moscow treaty with life. As a result of the stricter Cocom bans and other discriminatory measures imposed by the United States, the FRG's readiness to submit as a

vassal to the U.S. strategy gradually has had an adverse effect on economic ties between our countries although it was precisely in this field where the aforementioned process had had particularly positive results, results that caused displeasure on the part of West German industry's overseas competitors. However, what is of decisive significance in our relations, and this must be stressed again, is precisely security issues. The FRG's definite demotion to a deployment area, in the strategic as well as European sense, for a first strike against the Soviet Union could shake the very foundations of the treaty.

Is the FRG really attracted to such a degree by the prospect of "reverting" from a subject to an object of international relations that it has to copy every change in the U.S. hegemonistic nuclear strategy? Such a development would also be bound to obstruct any further normalization of relations between the FRG and the GDR, Poland, and the other socialist countries. In this respect the FRG is already no longer living on the high interest rates of the Moscow treaty, but rather is living off the capital, as it is said in German.

The FRG is in a very good position to render effective assistance in preventing the militarization of space; to contribute to progress at the Geneva negotiations between the USSR and the United States; and to contribute to the implementation of the significant peace initiatives by the Soviet Union.

This also applies to nuclear weapons in Europe. If the West is not ready for the radical solution we have proposed -- namely, the complete removal of nuclear weapons from Europe -- then we would like to know what Bonn's objections actually are to the Soviet Union's concrete proposal aimed at restricting its intermediate-range weapons in Europe to the number of carrier systems and warheads in the British and French nuclear forces? For the first time in postwar history, the acceptance of this proposal would actually allow the creation of a strictly European nuclear balance on the continent.

We note with satisfaction that on the subject of security issues and the creation of a zone in central Europe free of nuclear and chemical weapons, views are held in the FRG within the parliamentary opposition, within the SPD and the Greens, that are similar or parallel to Soviet views. A number of statements by FDP leaders on continuity in Ostpolitik are also cause for hope.

We hope that the CDU/CSU, which as the leading party in the coalition substantially determines the course taken by the West German state, will also not allow the dangerous following in the wake of the U.S. hegemonistic nuclear strategy to continue, and that it will respect the principle of mutual consideration for security interests and disassociate itself expressly from all attempts to revoke the FRG's recognition of postwar realities in Europe as postulated in the treaty. This would undoubtedly not only ensure further constructive development of Soviet-FRG relations, but would also facilitate the return to the vital sources of detente that, as stressed by Mikhail Gorbachev, in our view is nothing but a stage of transition from a world crammed with weapons to a reliable and comprehensive system of international security.

CSO: 5200/1363

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

TASS REJOINDER ON THATCHER COMMENT ON UK, FRENCH DETERRENT FORCES

LD061451 Moscow TASS in English 1442 GMT 6 Aug 85

["On British and French Missiles--Rejoinder"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, August 6 TASS -- By TASS political news analyst Anatoliy Krasikov:

Britain's Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, in an interview with the Italian newspaper LA REPUBBLICA, has touched, specifically, on the so-called nuclear deterrents of two European members of the North Atlantic alliance.

The newspaper's correspondent asked her if Britain was prepared to conduct talks on the future of Trident missiles in a global context, spreading to other powers, and whether the future of the British and French deterrents was related.

Mrs Thatcher replied that, given the present correlation of forces, it would be, of course, impossible to conduct talks on their reduction. She stressed that the aggregate potential of the French and British nuclear forces accounts for only 2.5 per cent of the overall nuclear might of the USSR and the United States.

Let us point out that the Soviet Union never suggested that Britain, or France reduce their nuclear missile forces. The point at issue is something other than this -- the forces, small as they are compared with the corresponding potentials of the Soviet Union and the United States, do exist, and, therefore, should be taken into account during an in-depth analysis of the military-strategic situation in Europe.

It takes a very naive person to swallow the bait of those who equate British and French armaments with the American and Soviet ones, as if Britain and France belong to one military-political alliance, while the USSR and the United States to another.

Confronting the Soviet medium-range missiles in Europe are nuclear missiles owned by three powers: The United States, Britain and France. Of course, the USSR would prefer that not a single missile of this kind remain on the European continent. But, taking into account the stance of the British and the French Governments, the Soviet Union is prepared to cut its medium-range missiles in the European zone to the level equal, counting warheads, to the corresponding nuclear armaments of Britain and France which are U.S. NATO allies. Confrontation between the USSR and the United States in Europe on this type of armaments would thus be reduced to nil.

CSO: 5200/1363

## INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

### MOSCOW TO JAPAN: U.S. NUCLEAR DEPLOYMENTS HIGHLIGHTED

OW100933 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 9 Aug 85

[Dmitriyev commentary: "Runway for Aggression"]

[Text] According to KYODO news service, seven more F-16 fighter-bombers have been deployed to the U.S. Misawa Air Base in Aomori Prefecture. The F-16 is the newest U.S. fighter-bomber capable of carrying nuclear arms. Radio Moscow commentator Dmitriyev writes as follows in this connection:

Despite the protests of Misawa residents and people throughout Japan, Aomori Prefecture has been accommodating what the U.S. military newspaper PACIFIC STARS AND STRIPES calls the Pentagon's or U.S. Department of Defense's nuclear spearhead in the Far East. With these additional 7 planes, Misawa Air Base now has a total of 18 F-16 fighter-bombers. The United States plans to deploy a total of 52 F-16 fighter-bombers, capable of carrying nuclear arms, by March 1987.

Among the over 100 U.S. military bases and installations in Japan, Misawa Air Base has been assigned a particular mission. Military bases in Japan have major missions assigned to them.

For example, Yokosuka Base is a strategic point for war preparations in the Pacific, while the military bases on Okinawa play the role of relay points for U.S. military units deployed in South Korea and various other countries in Asia. A rapid deployment force is also stationed on Okinawa to carry out armed intervention in every sector of the Asian continent.

Then, what role has been assigned to Misawa Air Base? Under the Pentagon's plans, Misawa houses a unit designed to carry out direct nuclear strikes against the Soviet Union. Neither the U.S. nor the Japanese Governments conceal this fact. This is the very reason for the extreme importance U.S. strategists attach to Misawa.

In turning the Misawa base into a strategic point for aggression against the Soviet Union, the U.S. and Japanese Governments state this is necessary to counter the increasing Soviet military threat. Even those who clamor about this threat do not really believe in this worn-out pretext.

The trend has become particularly conspicuous these days. For example, since the beginning of this year the number of visits to Japanese ports by nuclear-capable U.S. vessels has doubled compared with before. There is also a plan to deploy satellite-attacking missiles to Kadena Air Base on Okinawa. This literally means that Japan is being dragged into the U.S. program for the nuclear militarization of space.

We can see the three nonnuclear principles being emasculated as a result of the Japanese Government's open connivance everywhere; at Misawa Base, at Yokosuka Base where vessels capable of carrying Tomahawk cruise missiles are frequently visiting, and at Kadena Base on Okinawa.

In his recent interview with Prime Minister Nakasone, a moderator for U.S. NBC television said that everybody in the United States is aware that the United States is bringing nuclear weapons into Japan. The Japanese people, too, are under no illusions in this regard.

According to a recent public opinion survey, 79 percent of the respondents to a questionnaire doubt that the three nonnuclear principles are being observed. The survey also disclosed that an absolute majority of the Japanese people support the three nonnuclear principles. This is the desire of the Japanese people. Nevertheless, the plans are to deploy eight more F-16 fighter-bombers to Misawa Base by September at the Pentagon's request, in disregard of the Japanese people's wishes.

CSO: 5200/1363

MUTUAL AND BALANCED FORCE REDUCTIONS

POLISH REPORTS, COMMENTS ON END OF 36TH ROUND

20 June Session

Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU in Polish 21 Jun 85 p 7

[Text] Vienna, (PAP)--In Vienna on Thursday [20 June] there was another session--the 399th--of delegations from 7 socialist countries and 12 NATO countries participating in the talks on armed forces and armaments reductions in Central Europe. One of the speakers was Ambassador Marcel Rymenans, chairman of the Belgian delegation, who devoted his speech mainly to presenting once again the Western stance on the procedure for reducing forces and on control issues.

27 June Session

Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU in Polish 28 Jun 85 p 7

[Text] PAP correspondent Franciszek Malinowski writes: On Thursday [27 June], there took place the 400th plenary session of 19 delegations from the Warsaw Pact and North Atlantic Pact states participating in the Vienna talks on armed forces and armaments reductions in central Europe. Ambassador Enyo Savov, chairman of the Bulgarian delegation, referred to this fact in his speech. He pointed out that the Vienna talks have already lasted 12 years and have still not brought any results. He also mentioned the fact that the USSR has set a good example of good will and unilaterally withdrawn 20,000 soldiers and 1,000 tanks from the GDR. Unfortunately, apart from this one case, the military potential in this part of Europe has not been reduced. The Bulgarian diplomat stressed that the socialist countries have made various proposals in Vienna on more than one occasion. Nevertheless, he said, it is with pain that one notices that the Western participants are still limiting themselves to repeating the arguments based on their unaltered stance. In conclusion, he called on the Western participants to give a concrete reply to the socialist countries' February initiative, which would make it possible to break the deadlock in the Vienna talks.

Warsaw TRYBUNA LUDU in Polish 13-14 Jul 85 p 7

[Text] The 36th round of Vienna talks on mutual armed forces and armaments reductions in central Europe ended on 11 July. PAP correspondent Franciszek Malinowski asked Ambassador Stanislaw Przygodzki, chairman of the Polish delegation, for a summation and assessment. S. Przygodzki said, among other things:

The round of talks that has just finished has not broken the deadlock, despite the efforts of the socialist states. Let us recall that in February, the Warsaw Pact states presented a draft of basic agreements concerning preliminary USSR and U.S. land forces and armaments reductions in central Europe, to be followed by a nonincrease in the level of armed forces and armaments of both sides in this region. The purpose of our initiative was to break, as it were, the incapability barrier at the Vienna talks and create conditions for rapid results.

Unfortunately, the 36th round has not shown that the West intends to act in this direction.

Let us take the size of reductions as an example. The West is still trying to impose on the Warsaw Pact states an extent of reductions that is incommensurate with the reductions it regards as appropriate for itself. The West justifies this by means of the alleged predominance of conventional forces in central Europe belonging to the socialist states, and by means of the United States' considerable distance from this region and the consequent transportation difficulties. The first of these arguments is quite simply not true. This has been clearly illustrated by the two exchanges of information held on the subject of the size of each side's armed forces in central Europe. The second argument not only glosses over the constantly improving transportation--confirmed by the United States itself, which says it is capable of moving six divisions and 80 air squadrons to Europe in 10 days, which means a total of about 300,000 men--but also ignores the fact that U.S. territory is not the only place from which support for NATO forces in central Europe would come. U.S. forward bases also exist, and one should take into account the potential of the NATO member-countries, whose territories are in the immediate vicinity of the proposed region of reductions.

The delegations from the socialist states, including ours, have related to the speeches of Western representatives in a thorough and well-documented way. They have shown that the NATO long-term military potential development programs, including the development of conventional capability, clash directly with the aims of the Vienna talks and with these states' own declarations concerning the need for concrete results at these talks.

CSO: 5200/3075

## NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

### DANISH GOVERNMENT JOINING ZONE CONFERENCE IN CONSENSUS SEARCH

Copenhagen BERLINGSKE WEEKENDAVISEN in Danish 14-20 Jun 85 pp 1, 12

[Commentary by Solveig Rodsgaard]

[Text] Social Democratic Party chairman Anker Jorgensen has the support of the government parties for his proposed Nordic parliamentary congress on the subject of a Nordic nuclear-free zone. The government parties are backing this proposal to show their interest in restoring the broad consensus on Denmark's security policy but there has been no change in their view that nuclear-free zones must be seen in a European context and established with guarantees from both superpowers and for this reason the government parties have set a number of conditions concerning the form, content and date of the conference.

On Monday a committee of 10 members of parliament, two from each Nordic country, will meet to prepare for the conference which will be held in Copenhagen. Anker Jorgensen and Liberal group chairman Ivar Hansen will represent Denmark. Anker Jorgensen wants the parliamentary conference to be held on 27 and 28 October. The government parties do not want the conference held before around 1 December, well after the municipal elections are held on 19 November, and they also feel the conference can be held in a single day. Anker Jorgensen has suggested that the conference be set up on the same distribution basis as Nordic Council meetings, which would call for 87 participants. The Radical Liberals also support this. The government parties are opposed to this idea, mainly in order to avoid confusion between the conference and the Nordic Council, which is not concerned with foreign and security policy issues. But the Social Democrats and the government parties agree that the conference should not issue statements of any kind. With this approach Anker Jorgensen is trying to guard himself against pressure from SF [Socialist People's Party] to make stronger statements than those in Folketing's security policy resolution of 1 November 1984.

Anker Jorgensen's proposal for a conference of Nordic members of parliament on the Nordic region as a nuclear-free zone was supported by Nordic Social Democratic leaders when the joint committee of Social Democratic parties and labor unions met in Oslo on 16 and 17 January. A statement from those attending the meeting, who included Swedish Prime Minister Olof Palme and



Finnish Prime Minister Kalevi Sorsa, also said that the Nordic countries should draw up a plan of action for the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the Nordic region.

When the Nordic Conservative Party leaders held their annual meeting this year in Helsinki on 11 February the proposed parliamentary conference was one of the items on the agenda. In a statement from the meeting the Conservative leaders said that their parties were prepared to participate in discussing the plans for the conference. In Denmark Prime Minister Poul Schluter then turned the matter over to the chairman of the Conservative Party's Folketing group, Knud Ostergaard.

#### Plan

On 20 March Anker Jorgensen sent a letter to other Folketing group chairmen containing his ideas on the conference and on 16 April the group chairmen discussed the plan. The group chairmen of the government parties had reservations about the date and length of the conference as well as the Nordic Council model. But all group chairmen supported the idea of a preparatory committee consisting of 10 members of parliament, two from each Nordic country.

On 10 May Anker Jorgensen got in touch with party group chairmen in the parliaments of Sweden, Finland, Norway, Iceland and Denmark. He asked for participation at a preliminary committee meeting in Copenhagen on 17 June and outlined the plans he had in mind. Namely that the conference should be held on 27 and 28 October, that it should be set up along the lines of the Nordic Council with emphasis on the fact that it had nothing to do with the Nordic Council, that Folketing speaker Svend Auken should run the conference, that the conference should work as a whole for the most part but that group work on some major issues could be considered, that the introductory speeches should be given by members of parliament or ministers, that a conference secretariat should be set up and that a conference fee of around 1000 kroner should be paid for each participant.

It is this plan of Anker Jorgensen's that will be discussed by the preparatory committee on Monday. Participants at the meeting in addition to Anker Jorgensen and Ivar Hansen will be Social Democrat Erkki Liikanen and Conservative Ilkka Kanerva from Finland, Conservative Jo Benkow and Social Democrat Kjell Magne Fredheim from Norway, Social Democrat Sture Ericsson and a nonsocialist member of parliament whose name has not yet been submitted to the people in Copenhagen in charge of the arrangement, representing Sweden, and Olafur G. Einarsson of the conservative Independence Party and Svavar Gestsson of the left-wing People's Alliance, representing Iceland.

Thus Iceland is not sending a Social Democrat to the committee meeting, which should come as no surprise to Anker Jorgensen. The Social Democratic chairman in Iceland, Jon Baldvin Hannibalsson, has accused his party colleagues in Norway and Denmark in the past of "being confused on security policy issues" and pursuing a policy in conflict with their former policy

and their commitments to NATO. As late as the Nordic Council meeting in Reykjavik in early March Jon Baldvin Hannibalsson rejected intervention from other Nordic Social Democrats in the question of a Nordic nuclear-free zone that included Iceland. "If we discuss nuclear-free zones, we will do so in cooperation with our allies. The Nordic region is already free of nuclear weapons but the nuclear threat to the Nordic region stems from the Soviet Union," he said to RITZAUS BUREAU at that time.

#### Cooperation and Influence

Anker Jorgensen has discussed his plan with the Nordic Social Democratic parties and Knud Ostergaard and the chairman of the Norwegian Conservative Storting group, Jo Benkow, have taken care of contacts with the Conservative parties. Ivar Hansen has not had any contact with the Liberal parties in the Nordic lands.

Knud Ostergaard did not want to participate as a Danish representative at the preparatory committee meeting with reference to his position as chairman of Folketing's special Security Policy Committee.

Concerning the conference itself Knud Ostergaard said that his party still feels that the Nordic region as a nuclear-free zone cannot be discussed in isolation and that it is important to stress that NATO solidarity cannot be broken.

"But since the socialist parties want to discuss this matter and we would like to restore the broad agreement we have had in the area of defense and security policy, we would like to participate in such a conference."

Ivar Hansen also emphasized that a Nordic nuclear-free zone cannot be removed from the security policy context.

"But the government parties' position is that it would be inappropriate if a conference of this kind included only the political left wing in the Nordic countries. We would rather participate and influence the dialogue and we would like to have a dialogue to test various viewpoints."

Ivar Hansen added that it is important that a compromise be reached on the form of the conference at the preparatory committee meeting on 17 June and he rejected Anker Jorgensen's proposal to set the conference up along the lines of the Nordic Council.

#### A Step Forward

Anker Jorgensen said that most people think the Nordic Council model is a good one.

"The distribution model is excellent, since it is not that easy to set up proper representation with the number of parties that exist in the Nordic countries. But of course it must be emphasized that this has nothing to do with the Nordic Council. I also think 87 participants is a good number and

it is not that many when we are talking about having five countries and many parties represented. I also think 27 and 28 October is a good date for the conference. It is not so close to the municipal elections that the conference would have a disturbing effect and it is a fairly long time after the Norwegian and Swedish parliamentary elections in September."

Anker Jorgensen had this to say about the background for suggesting the conference:

"I think grassroots movements, peace movements, environmental movements and so on are an excellent thing. But I think it is equally important for members of parliament alone, without the participation of the general public, to discuss a Nordic nuclear-free zone. This will be a step forward toward bringing the problems down to political reality. No, we are not trying to steal a march on the grassroots and peace movements, but an attempt to supplement their ideas and ours in a way that has something to do with political reality. And even though no statements will be issued by the conference, I do not think the discussions will simply go round and round. I am quite sure that the differences of opinion that do exist will clearly show what people think in individual parties and individual countries."

#### Security Debate

The issue of a Nordic nuclear-free zone has been included in many of the security policy debates initiated by the Social Democrats and the leftist parties during the reign of the four-party nonsocialist government. The most recent Folketing resolution dates from 1 November 1984 and was presented and approved by the Social Democrats with no outside support. The Radical Liberals, the Progressives and the Free Democrats voted against the proposal while the four government parties, the Socialist People's Party and the Left-Socialist Party abstained.

The resolution states: "Folketing instructs the government to work actively in all relevant international organizations to insure that Denmark remains free of nuclear weapons in peacetime, wartime and periods of crisis. Folketing confirms the resolution of 3 May 1984. Folketing is prepared to appoint an interim committee to deal with the government's statement on Danish security policy. Folketing will then go on to the next item on the agenda."

The resolution of 3 May that is referred to says among other things: "Folketing instructs the government to work in NATO and other international organizations to insure that Denmark remains free of nuclear weapons in times of peace, war and crisis by promoting the plans to make the Nordic region a nuclear-free zone in a larger European context. Nuclear-free zones must be guaranteed by the United States and the Soviet Union."

6578

CSO: 5200/2699

## NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

### DANISH PAPER DENIES NEED FOR NORDIC NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE

Copenhagen BERLINGSKE TIDENDE in Danish 24 Jun 85 p 10

[Editorial: "Nuclear-Free Zone"]

[Text] Recently a prominent representative of the peace movement wrote an article in INFORMATION. It was a soul-searching article which included the idea that the peace movement had a hard time selling itself. How could it acquire supporters for peace in view of the fact that we have peace and have had it for such a long time?

The situation is roughly the same when it comes to the issue of a Nordic nuclear-free zone. How can supporters be won over to an issue that is not an issue at all? The Nordic region contains no nuclear weapons and no one plans to change that fact. It is not part of any peacetime plans to deploy nuclear weapons in Denmark or any other Nordic country. From a strategic point of view it is unnecessary and from a political point of view it is impossible. As far as crises or wars are concerned, everyone knows that there are plans and instructions based on the fact that Denmark, Iceland and Norway are members of NATO. NATO has nuclear weapons at its disposal and if defense is to be effective the deterrent effect on potential aggressors must correspond to their intentions and capabilities. One can debate whether nuclear weapons can be eliminated over a broad front and on a multi-lateral basis that includes all powers. That is a debate that should be carried out and this is being done in the context of international arms control conferences. But this does not give Denmark any reason to take steps in addition to those that have already been taken over many years: pointing out in the proper context that it is a vital Danish interest to get substantive arms control talks under way.

In spite of this all sides have now supported holding a conference on a Nordic nuclear-free zone. A conference is not a binding body. It can listen to arguments, it can discuss things and it can even issue resolutions. But it does not direct Danish or Nordic foreign policy. Conferences are held on a great many things through the years but the decisive difference between this conference and many others is that just holding it could mislead many people into believing that there is reality or could be reality in its subject. Politicians from several parties will participate. They will

give it stature and voters will regard their presence as a guarantee that the topic of the conference is not totally unrealistic but close to the point where decisions are made.

It may be said that the conference can provide a meeting place for people of good will. That is not necessarily the same as saying that it will also be a meeting place for people with common sense.

6578

CSO: 5200/2699

## NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

### NEW ZEALAND PREMIER CHALLENGES U.S. ON PUBLIC OPINION

HK161051 Wellington THE EVENING POST in English 12 Aug 85 p 6

[Text] Auckland, Today (PA) -- The Prime Minister, Mr Lange, has challenged United States officials to "have a go" at changing New Zealand public opinion on the nuclear ships ban. Asked his reaction to remarks by senior United States officials that the Reagan Administration might appeal directly to the New Zealand public over the ANZUS row, Mr Lange said at the weekend: "It would have to be done with considerably more finesse than they've done so far."

He added: "But I would rather like them to have a go, even though it would be improper."

In such a contest, he said, there was no doubt his Government's anti-nuclear policy would win.

The prospect of the American appeal "over the head of the Government" was raised by the U.S. Secretary of Defence, Mr Caspar Weinberger.

The Prime Minister, in his first comments on the ANZUS dispute since the South Pacific Forum in Rarotonga last week, said the chances of Washington changing the minds of New Zealanders were remote.

Mr. Lange said: "If people who are so insensitive to the nationhood, to the feelings of New Zealand people, to the outcome of elections in July last year, are prepared to make the comments they did about Rarotonga -- the chance of them captivating the hearts and minds of the New Zealand public are very low."

The reference to Rarotonga was in relation to comments by a senior U.S. official about the South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty. A State Department spokesman, Mr Bernard Kalb, jokingly told a news conference the U.S. got from the Cook Islands a "message in a bottle" about the treaty.

Mr. Lange said the remark, although insensitive, did not affect his relationship with Washington. He felt that the United States, at the officials level, was stepping-up pressure on New Zealand.

"To be quite straightforward, that does not disturb me in the slightest," said Mr Lange. It also would be counter-productive because it could only upset New Zealanders who had weighed the nuclear issue carefully.

Mr. Lange reaffirmed his intention to introduce legislation, banning nuclear-capable ships, before the end of the year -- and after the Deputy Prime Minister, Mr Palmer,

had discussed it with the United States. He also bluntly dismissed a threat by the Democratic Party deputy leader, Mr Gary Knapp, to bring in an anti-nuclear bill unless the Government moved on the issue in 30 days.

"Mr Knapp," he said, "could not lift the cap off a can of sardines."

He also criticised the Leader of the Opposition, Mr McLay, who described Mr Lange's idea of a regional security plan in the South Pacific as half-baked and posturing.

Mr Lange said that, before the forum, there was considerable news-media speculation about concern for regional security following the latest problems in port access for nuclear vessels. "And so we trailed a fly over that conference in the form of a paper which was very unspecific as to any pact or security agreement," said Mr Lange. It had no definite form or command structure. It was simply an invitation to discuss the issue in New Zealand.

"What happened was they did not have anything to protest about."

No concerns were raised in private or open sessions, he said. It was a distinctly successful initiative.

CSO: 5200/4353

NUCLEAR-FREE-ZONE PROPOSALS

NEW ZEALAND POLITICIAN HITS ANTINUCLEAR STANCE IN SYDNEY

BK110806 Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0430 GMT 11 Aug 85

[Text] New Zealand's opposition leader, Mr Jim McLay, says the Lange Government has implemented a policy which imposes a greater defense burden on Australia. Speaking in Sydney at the New South Wales Liberals Convention dinner, Mr McLay said the New Zealand Government's ban on visits by nuclear ships would almost certainly mean the end of the ANZUS defense pact.

He said the ANZUS row was causing superpower rivalry in the South Pacific to intensify. Mr McLay described New Zealand's nuclear policy as a dangerous self-indulgence, and said the ban had damaged New Zealand's relationship with the United States and ultimately with Australia.

He said the whole of the Western alliance was concerned about the policy, so too the independence nonaligned states of the South Pacific. The New Zealand opposition leader said his country could not defend itself or provide adequate security for the Pacific island nations.

CSO: 5200/4351



## BRIEFS

NZ LEADER ON BAN LEGISLATION--New Zealand's prime minister, Mr Lange, has said that proposed legislation banning nuclear warships from New Zealand's ports must not be seen as anti-American. He gave an assurance that the legislation would be introduced only after what he called a thorough dialogue with the United States. Mr Lange was replying to criticism of the nuclear warships ban by the American secretary of state, Mr Shultz, after his recent talks with Australian leaders in Canberra. Mr Shultz has said that the New Zealand legislation would be followed by a review of the ANZUS defense treaty linking Australia, New Zealand, and the United States. Mr Lange said a redefined ANZUS involving the three partners might be useful but he stressed that New Zealand did not propose any change and had no intention of withdrawing from ANZUS. The New Zealand prime minister said he would have talks in the United States in October and his deputy, Mr Palmer, would visit Washington a month earlier. [Text] [Melbourne Overseas Service in English 1900 GMT 17 Jul 85]

AUSTRALIAN ON NEW ZEALAND, FRENCH STANDS--An Australian democrat, Senator (Norm Sanders) of Tasmania, has told the party's state conference in the Queensland capital, Brisbane, that Australia should support New Zealand's stand for an independent and nuclear-free Pacific. Senator (Sanders), who has just returned from a tour of Pacific islands, said the French nuclear presence in the Pacific, particularly in Papeete and Noumea, was increasing. He told the conference that France had stationed a nuclear-powered and -capable submarine in New Caledonia in an effort to establish itself as a world power. Senator (Sanders) said there were positive measures Australian could take to support Pacific countries in their call for a nuclear-free Pacific. [Text] [Melbourne Overseas Service in English 0430 GMT 21 Jul 85 BK]

CSO: 5200/4343

NUCLEAR TESTING

TASS INTERVIEWS GORBACHEV ON MORATORIUM

LD131710 Moscow TASS in English 1705 GMT 13 Aug 85

[Text] Moscow, August 13 TASS--Follow Mikhail Gorbachev's answers to questions from a TASS correspondent.

Question: How would you evaluate the reaction in the world to the new Soviet initiative--the introduction of a moratorium on nuclear explosions?

Answer: If one is to speak of the sentiments of the public at large, it appears that there is every ground to say that the new initiative of the Soviet Union, which has unilaterally discontinued any nuclear explosions and urged the United States to follow suit, has been received with approval in the world. In many countries, including the United States, prominent statesmen, political and public figures declare in support of the idea of a moratorium on nuclear weapon tests and urge also other nuclear powers to follow the USSR's example. Our proposal concerns a concrete, tangible measure. People see in it a hope for slowing down and then discontinuing the nuclear arms race.

I know that our initiative is not to the liking of everyone. Those in the West who have linked their policy with a further intensification of the arms race and who derive considerable profits from that do not want an end to nuclear tests. They oppose the moratorium because they do not want the nuclear arms assembly lines to come to a standstill. They cling to unattainable illusions of gaining military superiority one way or another. At the same time they are busy spreading yarns about the Soviet Union's policy, including in connection with our announced moratorium on nuclear explosions.

This was an honest and open move on our part. We introduced the moratorium being deeply convinced that it is essential to take practical measures with a view to stopping the build-up of nuclear arms and their further sophistication. We had no intention at all of placing the U.S. leadership in a difficult position. The President of the United States was notified in advance of our action by a letter in which we suggested that the American side act in an analogous way. One would like the U.S. leadership to respond positively to this call of ours. Public pronouncements by officials in Washington on the moratorium issue create the impression that they in Washington, unfortunately, are now preoccupied mostly with finding the most adroit ways of evading such a response. I will not make a mistake if I say that a different attitude is being awaited in the world.

Question: President Reagan recently said that the United States could not afford a moratorium on nuclear tests because it should complete its nuclear programmes. In so doing he asserted that the Soviet Union had completed an intensive series of nuclear explosions and could permit itself a respite. Is that so?

Answer: The decision on the unilateral discontinuation of nuclear explosions was made by the Soviet leadership after a thorough and comprehensive study. It was not an easy matter at all to take such a step. In order to introduce the unilateral moratorium we had to interrupt the testing programme, leaving it unfinished.

In the course of the current year before the moratorium was announced, practically the same number of nuclear explosions were carried out in the USSR as in the USA. If one is to speak of all nuclear tests which have been held until now, their number was much greater in the United States than in the USSR. And they in the White House know it.

But when taking the decision on the unilateral moratorium, the Soviet Union was guided not by arithmetics, but by principled political considerations, by the striving to help end the nuclear arms race and to induce the USA, as well as other countries possessing nuclear weapons, to make such a step.

Our goal is the complete and general cessation of nuclear weapon testing, and not some respite between explosions.

An opinion is being expressed that the introduction of a moratorium on nuclear explosions supposedly does not meet the interests of the United States. But a moratorium is an important step on the way to an end to the further sophistication of lethal nuclear weapons. Besides, the longer the period without tests, the more rapid will be the process of "ageing" of the stockpiled weapons. And finally, a moratorium creates more favourable conditions for reaching agreement on the termination of nuclear tests and for making headway towards the elimination of nuclear weapons altogether.

The question arises: What in this matter does not meet the interests of the United States, of the American people? This road does not suit only those who count on power pressure and who devise plans to create ever new types of nuclear weapons on earth and who have set themselves the aim of starting an arms race in outer space. But what does this have to do with the genuine interests of strengthening peace and international security, the striving for which has been repeatedly stated by Washington?

Attempts are being made to explain this unwillingness to end nuclear tests by a "lag" of the United States in the field of nuclear arms. But this is only a pretext. There used to be talk about a "lag" in bombers and later on--in missiles. However, every time that was a deliberate deception which was admitted afterwards by the people in Washington themselves. In other words, talk about a "lag" begins whenever there is striving to achieve military superiority and when there is no real desire to solve arms limitation issues. It is precisely on these matters that decisions should be taken by the political

leadership, and not on the basis of myths being created about the "Soviet threat," but proceeding from the real situation and the genuine security interests of one's country and the interests of international security.

Question: How do you visualize the problem of verification in the context of the proposal to end nuclear explosions?

Answer: The scientific and technical possibilities existing in this country, in the United States and in other countries provide the necessary degree of confidence that a nuclear explosion, even of a small yield, will be detected and will become known. Those who say to the contrary know that that is not so.

Unilateral steps to end nuclear explosions cannot, of course, solve to the end the problem of a complete and general cessation of nuclear weapon testing. An international agreement is essential for the problem to be solved once and for all. Apart from appropriate obligations, it would also contain an appropriate system of verification measures--both national and international ones. In short, we are for a verification of the ending of nuclear explosions but we are against the cessation of tests being substituted by their continuation in the presence of observers.

It must be recalled that the problem of the complete and general ending of nuclear weapon testing is by no means a new one. Several years ago it was considered in detail during the tri-partite talks between the USSR, the USA, and Britain. Questions of verification were also discussed there in the most detailed way. In many respects the sides were close to mutual understanding. But the United States broke off the talks because the limitation which were being worked out hindered the Pentagon's plans.

We repeatedly suggested to the United States that the talks be resumed. And today as well we are calling on it to resume them and achieve the complete cessation of nuclear weapon testing. The holding of such talks and the achievement of results at them would be much easier in conditions when the USSR and the USA would not be conducting nuclear tests. However, the United States does not want to return to the negotiating table. And this means that it is exactly the United States that does not want either an end to nuclear tests, or a reliable system of verification. No other conclusion can be drawn.

It is sometimes said that the question of ending nuclear weapon testing should be considered at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. Well, we are prepared to discuss it there as well. But in Geneva, the United States and other Western countries have been sabotaging the conduct of such talks for a long time already. Therefore, the point is not where to consider the cessation of nuclear weapon testing. What is important is to consider the problem seriously and without delay, with a view, among other things, to the forthcoming Soviet-American meeting.

Question: Is it possible nonetheless, in your view, to expect a positive solution to the question of nuclear tests?

Answer: Yes. I think it is. Although present attitude of the United States to our proposal does not inspire optimism, one would not like to lose hope. Because of the following. Too great is the responsibility resting with the Soviet Union and the United States for them to evade a solution to major security matters.

What we suggest is a real possibility to stop a further build-up of nuclear arsenals and to tackle in earnest the solution of the task of their reduction and ultimately their elimination.

CSO: 5200/1353

NUCLEAR TESTING

USSR: WESTERN PRAISE OF MORATORIUM PROPOSAL

WASHINGTON POST Comments

LD011752 Moscow TASS in English 1355 GMT 1 Aug 85

[Text] Washington August 1 TASS--The Reagan administration treated the Soviet Union's decision to stop unilaterally any nuclear explosions starting from August 6, 1985 "like something between a social error and an act of terrorism," the WASHINGTON POST writes today.

Some western ambassadors expressed surprise at the administration's brusque response to the proposal. The WASHINGTON POST goes on. To Paul Warnke, president Jimmy Carter's arms control negotiator, it is simple, "this administration does not want a test ban. It is not interested in arms control."

But here and there within the administration, even among the indignant thunderers, the WASHINGTON POST goes on, there is a ripple of unease. The proposal of a nuclear test ban, however manhandled by President Reagan, could have considerable appeal in Australia, New Zealand, Japan and even West Germany. People may come to think that it was not just the thing for Reagan to reply to an invitation to a dove-dinner with a bid to breakfast in the desert, with bombs, the paper writes.

A moratorium on nuclear explosions could slow down the arms race, since first-strike weapons that cannot be tested might never be built, the WASHINGTON POST emphasizes.

Positive Response Urged by Physicians

LD011951 Moscow TASS in English 1735 GMT 1 Aug 85

[Text] New York August 1 TASS--The international movement "international physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War," has called on President Reagan to give a positive response to the peaceful initiative of the Soviet Union which has unilaterally decided to stop all nuclear blasts, and introduce a similar moratorium. The international scientific community believes that the introduction of a ban on nuclear tests is quite verifiable, it is said in this organization's appeal to the President of the United States. We call on you to avail yourself of this historic possibility which will help ensure security for all Americans and for the Whole world, the authors stress.

Defense Information Center Response to Proposal

LD012107 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 1 Aug 85

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Text] In Washington, at the center for Defense information, our correspondent Vladimir Dunayev had a meeting with the leaders of that public institute, Rear Admiral (retired) Gene la Rocque, and Rear Admiral Eugene Carroll:

[Begin video interview in English, with superimposed Russian translation]

[Dunayev] How do you rate the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev?

[Translator] Adm. Carroll and I have sent a telegram to General Secretary Gorbachev, congratulating him on his statement which is addressed to the entire world. I think, says Adm. La Rocque, that this initiative of Gorbachev's will go down in history as one of the most significant events of the nuclear era. The Soviet leader has made an enormous contribution to the reduction of tensions in American-Soviet relations, and the generals, admirals and officers among those who think the same way we do--who know better than others how great is the threat to mankind--will do everything to get our government to agree to the logical proposals made by Gorbachev. We consider that in the interest of mankind, in the name of maintaining life on our planet, we should stop the testing of nuclear weapons.

We are very pleased, declared Adm. Carroll, that General Secretary Gorbachev has made this initiative. There are already accumulated in the world 55,000 nuclear warheads, and if the tests continue, there will be even more weapons and even less security. The American administration has just refused to halt nuclear testing, which the Pentagon needs in particular for preparing star wars. Do you consider that by 1 January the position will change? On 6 August in America and all over the world there will be many, many demonstrations marking the 40th anniversary of the explosion of the bomb at Hiroshima. I believe that these demonstrations will turn into a demand to halt nuclear testing. And this movement will grow all over the world in the coming months until the United States responds to the Soviet initiative and halts nuclear testing. [End video interview]

CSO: 5200/1353

NUCLEAR TESTING

USSR: CRITICISM OF U.S. RESPONSE TO MORATORIUM OFFER

Verification Issue

LD022143 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 2 Aug 85

["Vantage Point," presented by Boris Belitskiy]

[Excerpts] Here at radio Moscow we receive countless letters from people in Britain welcoming the Soviet Union's consistent advocacy of disarmament measures. But every now and then the writers of such letters urge that in addition to proposing treaties, agreements, and conventions on various aspects of disarmament the Soviet Union should take a significant step unilaterally. This, they argue, would set an example the west would feel obliged to follow. Such suggestions have come from members of Britain's campaign for nuclear disarmament, from members of the organization lawyers for nuclear disarmament, and simply from ordinary people who tune in to our broadcasts.

Well, as you've probably heard, the Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev this week announced such a measure.

A mutual suspension of such testing would be extremely important, it would inhibit the development of new, even more dangerous, weapons of mass destruction and thus strengthen strategic stability in the world. It would be an example to the other nuclear powers and it would facilitate the conclusion of a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty.

Unfortunately, however, the initial American response to the last Soviet unilateral disarmament measure has once again been discouraging. Without even bothering to study the measure properly Washington rejected it out of hand. The excuses given for this rejection are threadbare. It was claimed, for example, that the Soviet Union had accelerated its testing program in preparation for the suspension. This is completely wrong. Reuters reported this week that the Soviet Union has this year carried out fewer underground nuclear tests than the United States has, and last year too the picture was the same--more American than Soviet tests.



Another argument voiced in Washington, and echoed by some of the media in Britain, is that the Soviet suspension is unverifiable. This too is completely wrong. Two prominent American scientists among many all over the world have carried out studies proving that seismic instruments can now monitor even small nuclear explosions anywhere in the world and even should attempts be made to evade detection. The two American scientists who have produced convincing proof of this are men of unimpeachable credentials. Dr Lynn Sykes is professor of geological sciences at Columbia University and head of the earthquake studies group at the university's geological observatory. His coauthor, Dr (Jack Ebendon), is program manager at the United States geological survey's national center for earthquake research. As they conclude in their joint study, there can be no substance to any doubts about the efficacy and reliability of present methods of nuclear test explosion verification.

Nor is this the first unilateral step taken in the nuclear arms field by the Soviet Union. In April the Soviet Union unilaterally suspended the deployment of intermediate range nuclear missiles in Europe until November. Earlier still the Soviet Union stated it would not be the first to deploy antisatellite weapons in space, and finally there is the well-known unilateral pledge by the Soviet Union not to use nuclear weapons first.

The fact that all these unilateral moves have been brushed aside by Washington clearly shows where the momentum for the nuclear arms race is coming from.

#### Army Paper Commentary

PM071541 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 Aug 85 Second Edition p 3

[Captain Second Class Ye. Nikitin "Military Political Review": "Halting the Nuclear Adventurism"]

[Text] World public attention is currently focused on two mutually exclusive and, at the same time, interrelated events. One of them took place 40 years ago and is designated in world history as the gravest of all known crimes and outrages. The other belongs to our day and is viewed by people as an act of goodwill of exceptional importance of the fate of peace.

The first event was the U.S. nuclear bombing in August 1945 which reduced the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki to ashes. The second is geared to delivering mankind from the threat of nuclear destruction once and for all. It is the Soviet Union's supremely important peace initiative, which has captured the thoughts and feelings of all peoples in the world. It was set out in CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev's 29 July statement. It concerns the Soviet Union's decision to unilaterally halt all nuclear explosions as of 6 August. The USSR urged the U.S. government to take similar action--to halt U.S. nuclear explosions on the same date. The Soviet moratorium lasts until 1 January 1986, but it will continue to operate

if the United States refrains from carrying out nuclear explosions. The exceptional importance of the Soviet Union's step is indicated by the extent of the world approval of the decision.

You do not have to be a military specialist to see that tests are a kind of accelerator of the nuclear arms race. After all, it is through tests that new sorts and types of these mass destruction weapons are created and existing systems are improved. That is why the halting of tests would be an effective means of slowing down the entire process of the nuclear arms race.

Moreover, the halting of tests paves the way for the elimination of the nuclear arsenals already accumulated. If tests are halted it will consequently be impossible to modernize existing nuclear weapons. They will gradually become obsolete and lose their effectiveness. And this will lead directly to mankind's deliverance from the threat of nuclear war.

All sober-minded people in the world recognized this as the purpose of the Soviet Union's exceedingly important new initiative. But how did Washington react?

As for the U.S. Administration's position, as is known, there has been no official reply to the Soviet proposal yet. But the public reaction of U.S. official spokesmen cannot be considered constructive. Essentially, they have avoided responding to the Soviet proposal and have defended the U.S. continuation of its nuclear weapon tests.

They are unable to offer convincing arguments in favor of this stance; there simply aren't any. All that assistant to the President for National Security Affairs McFarlane could say, when asked about his attitude to the new Soviet peace initiative, was a sullen: "propaganda." It is not the first time the White House has resorted to similar so-called "arguments." Finding itself in a situation where it has no counter to the indestructible logic of the Soviet Union's peace-loving proposals, Washington calls them "propaganda."

It is clear from the reports coming in that official Washington has resorted to another "argument," without bothering to seriously analyze the Soviet proposal. In a hastily prepared statement a senior administration spokesman made the stock claim that the Soviet initiatives was geared to "freeing Soviet superiority."

The standard thesis about "Soviet military superiority" has been heard many times before. U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger's arguments are typical in this respect: "Approximate parity would be enough, but it does not exist," the Secretary laments. "We do not have the advantage we had in the fifties and sixties." Well I never! Apparently, there is no parity because the former advantage has disappeared. If the USSR and the United States have comparable strategic nuclear facilities, according to the Pentagon's logic, America is already lagging behind. It is this peculiar "thinking" that determines the negative U.S. attitude to the question of banning the nuclear weapon tests and nuclear explosions in general.

In order to throw a veil over its unconstructive stance, the White House hastily put forward its own "initiative" by inviting Soviet observers to attend a U.S. nuclear weapon test. It is indicative that the U.S. proposal relates to a one-off invitation. Moreover, the decision as to what test Soviet observers would be able to attend rests with the U.S. side and has yet to be taken. THE WASHINGTON POST provided a highly figurative description of the proposal: "While the Soviet Union invites the U.S. president to a peace dinner, the American President invites the Soviet Union to a nuclear breakfast."

The crux of the matter is that the Soviet and U.S. proposals are essentially incompatible, because implementation of the U.S. step would in fact mean acknowledgement of the legality of further U.S. nuclear weapon tests.

Official Washington's hypocrisy is obvious. It was also confirmed by THE NEW YORK TIMES. It printed an article, coinciding with the publication of the official White House version, in which it named some of the real reasons why the United States does not want to refuse to terminate nuclear tests. [as published] Citing senior administration spokesmen, the paper frankly states, in particular: "The Pentagon needs these tests to put the finishing touches to new types of mass destruction weapons and to create space weapons."

In fact, the "strategic forces modernization program" announced by Reagan on 2 October 1981 is in full swing. The program comprises MX ICBM's, trident nuclear missile submarines, two new types of strategic bombers, pershing-2 first-strike missiles, and ground-, sea-, and air-based long-range cruise missiles. According to data quoted in the U.S. press, the U.S. nuclear arsenal comprises about 26,000 weapons of 24 different types. By the beginning of the nineties it is planned to manufacture a further batch of more than 28,000 nuclear weapons of 19 types, including new ones.

That is why the White House is doing its utmost to avoid the very important Soviet initiative so widely welcomed by politicians and public forces advocating the prevention of the nuclear threat and the limitation and elimination of the arms race. There is only one explanation--the current U.S. administration's desire to destroy the established balance of forces and forge ahead into a position of superiority. This is the purpose of the extensive new U.S. military programs for creating and improving nuclear, conventional, and, eventually, space armaments.

The current U.S. administration has elevated the militarization of space to the level of state policy. It was no accident when Colonel Lousma, commander of one of the space shuttles, said, quite unabashed: "Space is a place from where it is possible to keep the whole world in dread."

As Lieutenant General Abrahamson, leader of the organization carrying out the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI), told the U.S. House of Representatives Science and Technology Committee, during the period from 1987 through 1990 there will be 1-2 space shuttle flights a year for purely military purposes. In subsequent years there will be 2-3. "When it comes to the actual creation of space strike armaments," the Pentagonite stressed,

"we will need about 5 flights a year." It should be noted that Abrahamson is not even trying to conceal the plans and tasks facing the organization he heads. None of your "investigations" or "scientific research" here. He did not beat about the bush--"creation of space strike armaments."

But that was only Abrahamson talking. Defense Secretary Weinberger himself has proclaimed: "I rule out the possibility of abandoning strategic defense either in the research stage or in the deployment stage."

In fact the entire system is to comprise space weapons based on new physical principles. There are various types of beam weapons, elementary particle accelerators, electromagnetic guns, and antimissile missiles. On the basis of the massive deployment of these space-, air-, and ground-based facilities the Pentagon strategists intend to ensure the "reliable" destruction of enemy missiles. This does not rule out, in fact it presupposes the use of atomic weapons--new types, what is more. Naturally, they cannot get by without testing the new nuclear devices.

The chief role in the extensive ABM system with space-based components which is being developed by the United States goes to the first space tier, whose facilities must be capable of destroying the greatest diversity of targets on earth, on the sea, in the atmosphere, and in space: enemy ICBM's, control centers, and military-industrial and administrative and political facilities. In other words, we are talking about the creation of space strike facilities. And once again it is proposed to use nuclear weapons in them. Not like those that were used 40 years ago against Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Not even like today's. But third-generation nuclear weapons.

And then the not-unknown E. Rowny--adviser to the U.S. President and Secretary of State on arms reduction talks--took the liberty of saying: "The concrete U.S. proposals at talks in the sphere of arms limitation are tailor-made to satisfy Soviet as well as U.S. security interests." It was as if it had not registered with former General Rowny what active General Abrahamson and his chief in the Pentagon had said about the "creation of space strike armaments." Presumably America is not going to attempt to destroy itself with space strike complexes in the "interests of Soviet security."

In fact, the implementation of the "star wars" program is bound to mean a new twist to the arms race, which is fraught with the terrible danger of a nuclear war which would incinerate mankind.

The reports of the U.S. ruling circles' negative reaction to the Soviet proposal are evidence of Washington's desire to continue preparing the material base for such a war. As THE NEW YORK TIMES states, the United States is committed to continuing nuclear tests for the purpose of developing the weapon systems it requires for waging "star wars" and also "for seeking ways of waging a protracted nuclear war."

That is why the peoples of the world must be supremely vigilant and resolutely fight for an end to the nuclear arms race and the elimination of the threat of nuclear catastrophe. The hole of the Soviet Union's consistent foreign policy and its new peace-loving initiative are geared to the attainment of this goal.

6 September 1985

## U.S. 'Guilt' on Hiroshima

LD061741 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 6 Aug 85

[Text] The decision to halt any nuclear explosions announced unilaterally by the Soviet Union comes into effect today. Over to Political observer Aleksandr Druzhinin:

[Druzhinin] The whole history of the Soviet Union's struggle for nuclear disarmament in the postwar years is brought to mind on this day. The first thing I would like to say is that if back in 1946 the Soviet proposal to conclude a convention on the banning of nuclear weapons had been adopted the world would have been saved from the nuclear arms race and we would not have to speak about a threat of a repetition of the Hiroshima tragedy today. But the United States, as is known, prevented the adoption of the Soviet proposal. Already then Washington was dreaming of military superiority over the Soviet Union, and atomic weapons were seen as an opportunity of attaining and strengthening such superiority. The American position in subsequent years did not change either. While our country demonstrated its readiness on more than one occasion to begin nuclear disarmament at any time if agreement was reached with other nuclear powers the negative approach by the United States in fact blocked the solving of this most important problem.

What are Washington's official circles worries about today, when the Soviet Union's decision to unilaterally halt nuclear explosions comes into effect? They are thinking of new allocations to the Pentagon, which would allow it to go over to the next spiral in the nuclear arms race. The American military budget for the next fiscal year envisages record spending on this aim. The increase in arsenals of MX strategic nuclear missiles will be continued. Twice as much as this year is being allocated to implementation of the so-called star wars program, for the creation of space weapons that are so destructive and so refined that the atomic bombs that killed 370,000 inhabitants of Hiroshima and Nagasaki look primitive in comparison. All this suggests an idea which is as simple as it is important: the joint efforts of all states is needed to eliminate the threat of nuclear war, and above all, it is necessary that Washington should reconsider its policy, which already for 40 years, since the first atomic bomb was exploded over Hiroshima, has been a policy of refusing nuclear disarmament.

Owing to the new Soviet peaceful initiative a situation has now come about when it is possible to make a very important step toward ending the nuclear arms race. As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stated, the Soviet Union is ready to extend its moratorium after 1 January next year, if the United States for its part shows readiness to join its efforts and refrain from carrying out nuclear explosions. Forty years ago, when the United States exploded the first atomic bomb and thereby opened the era of nuclear weapons, it bore the gravest guilt before mankind. Surely it is clear that now the U.S. refusal to join in the Soviet initiative places on Washington in the eyes of the world public full responsibility for the world's decline toward a new nuclear catastrophe.

U.S. 'Nervousness'

OW070831 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1045 GMT 6 Aug 85

[From "The World Today" program presented by Dmitriy Biryukov]

[Text] Hello comrades: The moratorium on carrying out any nuclear blasts by our country, announced on behalf of the Soviet Union by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, came into effect today, 6 August.

The position of the USSR in the struggle to liquidate nuclear arms was reasserted in Comrade Gorbachev's response to the message of the Japanese Council of Organization of Victims of Atomic bombings, published today. The Soviet initiative has been supported by foreign state, political, and public figures and all organizations of peace supporters. The governments of many countries officially approve of the Soviet Proposal.

The White House reacted to the Soviet initiative quickly and unambiguously. After acquainting himself with the Soviet document, the U.S. President declared that there can be no talk about ending tests at present. He confirmed this at his latest press conference. When journalists, who were perplexed by Washington's reaction, asked Robert MacFarlane, Presidential adviser for national security, for an explanation for the U.S. position, the response was extremely vague. MacFarlane said that the President wants an absolutely serious approach to the question of arms control. Surprising logic. Our country proposed to ban nuclear tests completely. Moreover, it has unilaterally stopped such tests for a considerable time. However, at the same time in Washington they are discussing how to improve control over such tests.

Representatives of the administration maintain: The Russians will trick us if we naively believe them. Contradictions abound; After all, Comrade Gorbachev's statement makes it absolutely clear that the USSR will not carry out tests in future if the United States ends its tests. One highly placed White House official, who asked not to be identified, summed up Washington's position as follows: It should be shown without delay that there can be no talk about this so as not to raise hopes that moratorium may occur.

Why has Washington exhibited such nervousness, haste, and concern over the issue of ending nuclear tests? There are several explanations. We only need to recall the so-called Star Wars program. The U.S. President and other representatives of the current administration have asserted repeatedly that Star Wars is supposedly not a nuclear program. However, this in fact is not so. To develop one of the important components of the program, laser x-ray radiation, nuclear tests are essential. According to U.S. military strategists, they are also needed to develop methods of waging a protracted nuclear war.

Of course, not everyone in America has such shortsighted sentiments. Sensible Americans, and some members of Congress included, understand that there can be no victors in a nuclear war. They condemn the position taken by Washington and justly consider that it is precisely U.S. tests that can create an additional threat to peace.

#### Reagan Statements 'Confused'

LD071909 Moscow TASS in English 1829 GMT 7 Aug 85

[Text] Washington August 7 TASS--Washington has assumed a negative stand with regard to the decision of the Soviet Union to stop unilaterally any nuclear explosions, and in the future is going to continue its nuclear tests. All kinds of "explanations" and "closer definitions" made by spokesmen for the White House and the Department of State after the latest press conference of President Reagan are proof to it.

As is known, at a press conference held on August 5, Ronald Reagan, when asked by journalists about the attitude to the proposal of the Soviet Union to introduce moratorium on nuclear tests, alleged that the USSR was overtaking the U.S. in the development and modernization of nuclear weapons and that the U.S. had not yet started the testing of some of its weapons that it would like to test.

At the same time, the president said that if after the period of the limited moratorium the USSR wished to make it permanent and agreed to a bilateral verification of the tests, the U.S. was ready to agree to it.

This statement of President Reagan gave rise to a number of questions on the part of journalists who wanted some of the points to be specified. He was asked, among other things, if he intended to put forward a proposal on introducing a permanent moratorium on all the tests at the end of the current year. The president hurried to correct himself and said that he did not know if the U.S. would be able to complete its tests by that time. At the same time, he said that if the U.S. completed the tests and the Soviet Union refrained from conducting them, then it might be possible to introduce a moratorium. Ronald Reagan at once "corrected" his own words by adding that the U.S. had not yet approached some stages of the tests and he did not know whether it would be able to do so by the end of the current year. He meant the "Midgetman" missiles.

All these confused statements of Reagan on a joint moratorium brought about an immediate response of the Department of State. "Necessary explanations" were given to the U.S. press after the press conference. It turned out that the president had not put forward any new initiative. The first thing to do is to resolve the problem of control over nuclear explosions. The U.S. should allegedly modernize its armaments in the face of some "unprecedented Soviet buildup". Specifically, a spokesman for the White House stressed that the president had not said that the U.S. would agree to a complete moratorium on nuclear explosions after completing the tests



of new strategic armaments. The president had only said that this question was being discussed in the U.S. According to the spokesman, the moratorium on the tests proposed by the Russians is not the most important aspect of the problem of nuclear weapons. He maintained that the most important aspect was the reduction of Soviet armaments.

This, in his opinion, would create an incentive for stopping nuclear tests.

Commenting this confusion in the White House and the Department of State, the London-based newspaper "TIMES" pointed out that the president had vaguely hinted at a possibility of the introduction by the U.S. of a moratorium on nuclear explosions, following the example of the USSR. However, the newspaper underlined that the U.S. Administration had hurried to turn down this possibility. Such a conclusion follows from the hasty statement of the White House to the effect that the president's speech did not contain any new initiatives. It has become clear that Reagan realized how imprudent his statements were and later tried to correct them, the newspaper wrote.

Thus, the U.S. has again made it clear that it is concentrating its attention not on the termination of the nuclear arms race, but on its continuation and on the modernization of armaments.

#### Ridgeway Remarks Criticized

LD091430 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 8 Aug 85

[Text] The unilateral Soviet moratorium on all nuclear explosions announced by Mikhail Gorbachev 29th July went into effect 6th August, the 40th anniversary of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima. The moratorium will last until next January 1st but will be extended if the United States refrains from its own tests.

After playing around for some time with verification problems, the White House has changed the tune slightly and said that the United States would consider joining the Soviet Union but after it completed its testing program. The trouble is that nobody in Washington knows how long the American testing will last. Given the scope of the nuclear buildups and the huge investments into star wars, which also requires the constant improvement of yields, the day when we will all rejoice and sigh with relief over the halting of nuclear testing by America is not around the corner. In the meantime United States officials insist that there are ways nevertheless to build Soviet-American confidence. Rozanne Ridgeway, assistant secretary of state for European and Canadian Affairs assumed the post last month and on Wednesday made her first on the record comment. She repeated the President's invitation for a Soviet team to visit a testing site in Nevada and added that when you can get scientists and experts together they can begin to build some degree of confidence.

Improving the calibration of instruments and studying the structure of the ground of testing sites is important, but only as long as this serves the goal



of doing away with nuclear testing and getting rid of nuclear arms. Existing technologies are good enough to verify compliance with moratoriums. Therefore to exchange experts without wanting to stop tests is to perpetuate and in fact bless them.

The most amazing thing about Washington's reaction to the Soviet moratorium is not even the ease with which it was rejected. After all, all previous Soviet initiatives have been treated in the same way. Among them was the 1982 pledge by this country never to be the first to use nuclear arms. For 5 solid months a major nuclear power will not conduct any nuclear explosions. It will thus unilaterally refrain from updating its arsenal. It takes far more than simply restraint to watch others, the United States included, explode their warheads while being out of this mad race. According to foreign experts this year the USSR and the United States have conducted an equal number of tests. What's more, the Soviet decision to stop was taken despite the fact that overall the United States has conducted by one-third more tests than this country. And all this is declared propaganda. Nothing new or not adding to confidence and stability. And at the same time the American public is being told that nuclear testing, which has fueled the arms race, is quite normal and can even be a blessing because it can lead to a lasting friendship between Soviet and American experts monitoring them. One must have little or no respect for the mental abilities of people at home and abroad to say all this.

#### U.S. Said Ahead on Tests

LD081411 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 8 Aug 85

[Commentary by Yuriy Solton]

[Text] The Soviet Union's unilateral suspension of all nuclear blasts which came into effect on 6 August has arrested the attention of politicians and mass media in various countries. Yuriy Solton comments:

The Soviet initiative has met with the approval of the world public. Many believe an opportunity has opened up for signing a treaty on a comprehensive nuclear weapons test ban and ultimately liquidating nuclear weapons. Many Americans share this view. However, judging by what Administration officials have been saying in public, the White House is unwilling to turn an attentive ear to this opinion. The Soviet Union has formally called on the United States Government to join in the moratorium and suspend its nuclear tests. What is Washington's reaction? Instead of considering the proposal with responsibility, it has assumed the defensive. To beat back the demands for responding positively to the Soviet proposal, various pretexts have been invented. The Administration has been claiming that the United States cannot agree to the moratorium because the Soviet Union has allegedly carried out more nuclear tests. It has accused the USSR of having launched an unprecedented military build-up.

The real facts, however, point in the opposite direction. The United States Joint Chiefs of Staff reported to Congress earlier this year that at the most there was a rough nuclear parity between the Soviet Union and the United States. According to the Stockholm Peace Institute, the United States has carried out about one third more nuclear tests than the Soviet Union. If the tests of other Western nuclear powers are counted, the ratio will be one-and-half to one in favor of the West. Since the Reagan administration took office, spending on underground nuclear tests has doubled. In a few years another 3 billion dollars are going to be invested in expanding nuclear testing ranges and building new ones. Washington is thinking about a long-term nuclear weapon tests program and not about an end to nuclear explosions. Its thoughts are not about stopping the nuclear arms race but about upsetting the nuclear balance in its favor. Washington is afraid that an end to nuclear tests will call into question the Pentagon programs of nuclear rearmament and stop the development of space weapons. It's significant that when President Reagan at a recent news conference made hazy statements about the possibility of a future Soviet-American moratorium on nuclear blasts he was corrected at once. The State Department and the White House told the journalists that the President had not put forward any new initiative, that the United States should modernize nuclear armaments, and that the moratorium was only a matter of discussion.

Well, the United States still has time for discussion before the final decision is made. The Soviet moratorium will stay in effect until 1 January and would be prolonged if the United States refrains from carrying out nuclear explosions. The statements Washington officials have been making to date demonstrate that the Administration seeks not to put an end to the nuclear arms race but to press ahead with its militarist course which jeopardizes all nations.

#### 'Protracted' Nuclear War Plans

LD090240 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 8 Aug 85

[Text] Despite the fact that the Soviet Union has unilaterally stopped nuclear explosions the United States is determined to continue its nuclear tests. Why? Our observer Vladislav Kozyakov devotes his today's comment to this question.

[Kozyakov] It's easy to imagine what would happen if Washington joined Moscow--there would be no nuclear blasts in both countries. This would be a major contribution to building more confidence in Soviet-American relations, this would promote the Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons. The mutual moratorium would prevent the development of new types of nuclear arms and the modernization of the existing weapons. The Soviet Union's decision makes such a perspective possible. Actually Moscow invites Washington to undertake jointly a practical step toward curbing the arms race on earth and preventing it in space.

the measure. Such a joint move would pave the way for a complete and general ban on nuclear tests, which would mean a turn towards practical elimination of nuclear weapons. That was how political leaders and the public of many countries have rated the Soviet initiative, but United States Administration officials rejected the Soviet proposal out of hand under various pretexts, and on 6th August President Reagan said directly at a news conference that the United States would not stop its nuclear tests. It could only discuss the issue after lost ground had been covered, that is, after the United States had modernized its strategic nuclear arms.

What does that mean? When will the answer be given? Today the United States is developing and deploying six new types of offensive strategic weapons, with the help of which it would like to get ahead militarily. The program is up to the year 1990. There is a logical conclusion that the United States would like to freeze its negative approach to a stop of nuclear tests for at least another 5 years, or maybe for a much longer, indefinite period. At his news conference President Reagan reaffirmed the United States policy of continuing work to implement the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, that is a plan to prepare for Star Wars. That's another reason for the unwillingness of the United States to join the moratorium.

THE WASHINGTON POST says that the President's advisors oppose the moratorium first of all because it would interfere with testing those nuclear arms that are of vital importance for the Star Wars program. It's reported in the American press, which quotes Pentagon sources, that within that program powerful lasers are being developed that will use as a source of energy nuclear explosions in outer space. Work is also well ahead on developing strike, space based, nuclear arms.

There is only one way of curbing the arms race. This is to really stop it, that is, to give up tests, modernization and manufacture of armaments and to follow the path of scrapping the already stockpiled weapons. The unilateral Soviet moratorium on any nuclear explosions is a concrete step in this direction. There is a period of realistic opportunity to stop the manufacture of nuclear arms. To miss this opportunity is to frustrate the aspirations and hopes of the nations.

#### Security Argument Refuted

LD142024 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 14 Aug 85

[Excerpts] The mass news media throughout the world are showing great interest in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's replies to the questions of a TASS correspondent. At the microphone is political observer, Aleksandr Druzhinin:

In my view this interest has been caused by the following: First, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's replies once again, with the utmost clarity, the position of our country, which has introduced a unilateral moratorium on any kind of nuclear explosions; and second, the Soviet leader exhaustively replies

stands out as an ultrarabid anti-Soviet, an ultraprimitive anticommunist, and--as he demonstrated again the other day--a cynical slanderer and provocateur.

Speaking in Bonn, Perle called the Soviet Union's decision to unilaterally halt all nuclear explosions as of 6 August "pure propaganda pegged to the 40th anniversary of Hiroshima." If you believe the Pentagon assistant chief, the Soviet step conceals a wish to...outstrip the United States. "U.S. intelligence data show that the Russians have recently been stepping up their nuclear tests," Perle lied, without batting an eyelid.

His other "argument" sounds no less paradoxical: Since the Russians have halted all explosions, it is consequently "highly probably" that they are violating the 1974 Soviet-American treaty on limiting underground nuclear tests. And the President, he says, is so concerned about this that he has proposed inviting experts to one another's test sites. Apparently the USSR, which has halted all explosions, is supposed to "bless" the U.S. explosions by sending observers.

Perle's Bonn speech indirectly demonstrated the commotion caused in Washington's corridors of power by the new Soviet initiative. It was the U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense himself who revealed on the reasons for the confusion--by devoting a large part of his speech, as provocative as it was mendacious, to the defense of the "star wars" program.

"The military," THE NEW YORK TIMES writes in this connection, "have always been against halting underground tests for many reasons. But President Reagan's 'Strategic Defense Initiative' has introduced a new element. Although it is advertised as a nonnuclear program, it requires nuclear tests for one of its components--the X-ray laser." No denying that! The renunciation of all explosions would put a question mark against Pentagon programs now in full swing. So Perle is heaping slander on the Soviet Union which, according to his twisted logic, is coming out against the militarization of space because it is allegedly making top-speed preparations for it.

It is clear that Washington propaganda is indeed strapped if it has to use the pearls of stupidity and cynicism with which the U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense's Bonn speech was crammed. According to this provocateur's logic, apparently the best way to outstrip someone is to stop. One merely wonders why it hasn't yet occurred to anyone in Washington to use this simple method!

#### Star Wars Connection

LD101421 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 10 Aug 85

[Text] Now a commentary on Washington's reaction to the unilateral Soviet moratorium as of the 6th August on any nuclear explosions.

Even before it publicly announced the moratorium, writes our commentator Yuriy Solton, the Soviet Union urged the United States Government to join

On the other hand the U.S. Administration's refusal to positively respond to the Soviet moratorium is another indication that American policymakers are not prepared to take any practical action towards nuclear disarmament. The U.S. President said at a news conference on Monday that the administration rejected the Soviet proposal for a mutual moratorium and the matter would be considered when the United States completed its testing. Asked when the United States testing would end, he said: I don't know. A White House spokesman added to this later that the United States would continue the modernization program and "star wars" program which covers a period till the end of this century. The underground testing in Nevada is part and parcel of the plans to achieve military superiority and build a first-strike capability.

Here is what the latest press reports from Washington say: The Reagan administration officials said that the tests are needed to develop an X-ray laser for space weapons and to find ways to fight a long nuclear war. The administration plans to equip the MX missile, the (D-5) submarine-launched missile, the midgetman missile with new warheads. Government officials testified that such warheads could not be certified as workable without tests, which Congress approved this month. Officials also consider continued underground testing vital for other military programs. Without testing there would be little confidence, they say, that the complex system of command and control would permit what Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger has called a protracted nuclear war in which the United States could prevail.

Such are reported statements by the Reagan administration's officials. They were confirmed by the President himself when he stated at a news conference on Monday that the American testing of new types of nuclear weapons would be continued.

Against this background the Soviet Union's moratorium is a bold move, it proceeds from the hope that common sense will get the upper hand in United States policy. The Soviet nuclear explosions have been unilaterally stopped until 1 January 1986. The moratorium will remain in effect after that date if the United States follows suit. So the Reagan administration has some time to make corrections of its dangerous policy with regard to nuclear weapons tests, which threaten both the American people and the whole of mankind.

#### Perle Speece Criticized

PM081343 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Aug 85 First Edition p 5

[V. Ovchinnikov "Rejoinder": "Pearls of Cynicism"]

[Text] Richard Perle is so loathsome a figure that he scarcely needs an introduction. His position is an official one -- U.S. Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Policy. But his views and, chiefly, his actions bear the same relationship to international security as nuclear warheads do to gardening. Even amid the flock of Washington "hawks" Perle

to a question that undoubtedly disturbs people through the world--who is hindering a full and universal end to nuclear weapons' testing from at last becoming a reality? Actually, when we talk about widespread support for the new Soviet peace initiative, we inevitably have to provide a footnote that the United States, going against the mood of the public, has taken a different position.

Truly, just what arguments are official circles in the American capital giving to prove that, contrary to common sense, the Soviet proposal supposedly goes against U.S. security? Such security is seen by Washington's politicians not in halting tests of nuclear weapons, which would lead to slowing down and finally halting the arms race, but in building up this race by implementing the extensive American nuclear programs.

At first glance it is a strange logic, but only at first glance. Washington is, as before, striving for military superiority over the Soviet Union and for this reason is refusing to halt nuclear tests, trying to justify this step with references to some kind of mythical inferiority to the Soviet Union in the Area of nuclear weapons. The notorious problem of control also serves this same aim. Washington has used this as a cover on more than one occasion in the past too, trying to get out of accepting Soviet peaceful proposals. Do those in Washington now want Soviet specialists to go to the American nuclear proving ground in Nevada to control the power of nuclear explosions? Is it necessary to travel to the other end of the world for this? It is well known that both we and the Americans have sufficient scientific and technological resources to know about any nuclear explosions, without traveling across the ocean. So is the United States striving for a full halt to nuclear tests or the establishment of such, if one may say so, control, which would merely sanction their continuation? It is clear that the United States does not want either an end to nuclear tests or a reliable system of control, says Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in replies to a TASS correspondent.

Meanwhile, however, there is a chance, created by the Soviet Initiative, to stop the further build-up of nuclear arsenals. In order for such a chance to become a reality, however, they must understand in Washington that too much responsibility lies on the United States for it to evade resolving major questions on security and peace.

#### U.S. Objections Refuted

LD152154 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 1900 GMT 15 Aug 85

[Viktor Olin Commentary]

[Excerpts] Next our commentator Viktor Olin analyses the reaction of the United States Administration to the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions. He shows that the administration is doing everything to avoid a positive response to this initiative. This is what he writes:

Let's examine the arguments of the opponents of the Soviet Proposal. For one thing they claim the Soviet move is purely propagandistic. The USSR,

it is argued, has declared this moratorium after completing an extensive program of nuclear tests. They also argue that a total test ban is impossible because of inadequate verification procedures. Now, let's consider each of these arguments on its merits.

First concerning the charge that the USSR is trying to influence world public opinion. Unquestionably the Soviet decision to halt all nuclear explosions has produced a tremendous impression all over the world but this is mainly because the Soviet initiative harmonizes with the universal desire for an end to nuclear tests and is a simple and easy-to-implement means of stopping the nuclear arms race and laying the groundwork for its reversal with the ultimate complete abolition of strategic arsenals.

Now let's turn to the argument that the USSR has completed an extensive test program and wants to consolidate its advantage by urging the United States to join a moratorium. This is refuted by official American figures showing that the United States has carried out 50 percent more nuclear explosions than the Soviet Union has done. Any United States lag in this area is therefore out of the question. As for the allegations about the Soviet Union having completed a test program, even a White House spokesman has had to make the reluctant admission that the USSR may not have completed it when it introduced its moratorium on 6 August.

Finally verification. The claims of the United States Administration that there cannot be 100 percent failsafe [as heard] verification have been refuted by many experts. They pointed out that even the weakest nuclear explosions can be detected by national facilities. But even if there are doubts on this score in Washington, why not have the negotiators discuss national and international verification procedures? Clearly the problem is not an impossibility of negotiating a halt to nuclear tests but the unwillingness of the United States to do so. Witness the nuclear blasts that continue to resound under the sands of Nevada where work is in full swing on strike weapons for Star Wars. More and more new weapons systems is a motto Washington persists in clinging to but with every new explosion on earth security only diminishes.

#### U.S. Seeks Superiority

LD161728 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 16 Aug 85

["International Situation -- Questions and Answers" program presented by Moscow Radio commentator Konstantin Patsyuk with Aleksandr Druzhinin, Moscow Radio political observer; Vladimir Tikhomirov, head of the International Regional Problems of Asia and North Africa section of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Oriental Studies]

[Excerpts] Aleksandr Druzhinin looks at the impact of the Soviet nuclear moratorium initiative and other peace proposals on world public opinion. Many listeners have asked about the United States' stance regarding the Soviet proposals.



[Begin Druzhinin recording] "Well, let's start by looking at how Washington has reacted to our country's decision to unilaterally halt all nuclear explosions. To simply say that they reject the new Soviet peace initiatives would mean not to expose the tricks to which they resort in the official circles of U.S. policy in order to hoodwink the international public. Indeed, just look at the arguments now being put forward in the White House and State Department to somehow justify in the eyes of the people America's negative stance. They are saying, for example, that the United States requires continuation of nuclear weapons tests in order, they say, to eliminate a certain lagging behind in the field of nuclear armaments from the Soviet Union, although it is well known that far more nuclear tests have been carried out in the United States than in our country. They claim that an effective monitoring system of a moratorium on nuclear explosions somehow does not exist.

So what do they propose? Washington invites Soviet specialists to visit the American testing ground in the state of Nevada to monitor the extent of the explosions carried out there. But who needs that kind of monitoring? There already exist today sufficiently effective scientific-technical means of discovering any explosion in Nevada or anywhere else without encroaching beyond the border of the Soviet Union.

It therefore follows that the United States simply requires the presence of Soviet specialists at the Nevada testing grounds to somehow legitimize the continuation of American nuclear tests. Finally, they are stating in Washington that the question of nuclear tests should be resolved not by moratoriums but at the Geneva talks. But surely the United States had the same chance before? Surely this question was raised several years ago at the talks between the United States, the Soviet Union, and Britain? Surely no one has prevented Washington from making the question of ending nuclear weapons tests a subject of the Geneva talks? The whole crux of the matter is that at Geneva and at other international forums the United States has been openly sabotaging this problem. Why? Because the purpose of the U.S. Administration remains that of achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union, and to do so they need the nuclear arms race and they need nuclear tests, too, which help to build up arsenals of the latest weapons. And precisely what the United States does not want is an end to nuclear tests or a reliable monitoring system, stressed Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in his replies to questions by a TASS correspondent. No other conclusion can be drawn.

Washington is also conducting a policy of sabotage and obstruction in relation to other Soviet proposals which we have already mentioned today. Peace through strength, disarmament through building-up arms -- these statements are often being made by representatives of the Reagan administration.

But really they do not even contemplate disarmament, for military strength is the cornerstone of American policy which feeds the illusory hope that in this way the United States will succeed in establishing their own style of global order." [end recording]



## U.S. Alleges Propaganda

LD171644 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1215 GMT 17 Aug 85

[From the "international review" program presented by Eduard Mnatsakanov]

[Excerpt] In April of this year, the Soviet Union unilaterally halted the deployment of its medium-range missiles and the implementation of countermeasures in Europe, calling on the United States to follow this example and, for its part, to halt deployment of pershings and cruise missiles in Western Europe. In response, the same old cry of "propaganda!" rang out from across the Atlantic. On 30 July 1985, a statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was published in our press. On 6 August, the Soviet Union, once again, unilaterally, halted all nuclear blasts, and called on the United States to join this action. You do not have to be a military expert or a diplomat to realize that a Soviet-American moratorium would be a very serious step towards the complete and universal abolition of nuclear weapons, and that this, in its turn, would altogether block the way for the nuclear arms race.

The overwhelming majority of the world public, statesmen and politicians from different countries, and representatives of public and scientific circles, including in the United States itself, have been welcoming the fresh noble initiative of the USSR. This time, too, the Washington administration's reply has been, "propaganda!".

In his interview with a TASS correspondent, Comrade Gorbachev refuted convincingly, point by point, all of Washington's conjectures, which are designed merely to evade as deftly as possible acceptance of the Soviet proposal.

Finally, last night, another major initiative by our country was reported. The Soviet Union proposes that the agenda of the forthcoming 40th session of the UN General Assembly should include the issue of international cooperation in the peaceful conquest of space under conditions of the nonmilitarization of space. Comrade Shevardnadze's letter to the UN secretary general rightly points out the urgency of this issue. It must be resolved as rapidly as possible, before weapons have gone into space: the danger of this happening, after all, increases with each passing day. There has not yet been an official reaction from Washington to the new Soviet proposal, but it cannot be ruled out that Washington, through inertia, will again give a gloomy reply of "propaganda!".

The question that arises is this. If the constructive, specific and realistic proposals of the Soviet Union and even its bold unilateral steps towards the limitation of armaments are all propaganda, then why does the U.S. government not follow this example and join in this "propaganda" in favor of peace and international security? This would meet with approval in the Soviet Union, and throughout the whole world as well.

Unfortunately this is not happening however. On beginning his second presidential term, Reagan stated that he was ready to go the extra mile, as he put it, to meet the Soviet Union halfway on the matter of the limitation and reduction of nuclear armaments. This was an interesting statement, although of course no one needs extra miles. It is enough for the United States to go its half of the way toward reaching an agreement. Well, 9 months have passed since Reagan was reelected. What have we seen over this time? The U.S. Administration has blocked all progress at the Geneva talks. The "star wars" plans are being implemented. It has just been announced with much fanfare that the production of some of the newest kinds chemical weapons is being resumed. Nuclear weapons testing is continuing, the arms race is being shipped up not only at home but wherever possible from West Germany to Japan. That's how in actual fact Reagan's extra mile looks. If we are talking about miles, and in actual fact this time they have been "extra" ones, then they were covered in directly the opposite direction, toward the further exacerbation of international tension. As you know in November of this year the Soviet-American summit meeting is taking place in Geneva also. Now in Moscow, and one assumes in Washington as well, preparations are being made for it. Of course a personal meeting, a chance to get to know one another, and an exchange of opinions between the leaders of two of the largest states -- all this in itself is of great positive significance. But will a prerequisite for a turning point in Soviet-American relations toward normalization, stabilization, and mutual trust be created at Geneva? Will this meeting justify the hopes of peoples? This will depend on the presence or absence of political will from Washington. As for the good will of the Soviet Union, it can be seen in its numerous peace initiatives. We are not striving for military supremacy over anyone, whoever they may be. We are prepared to consider the legitimate interests of the United States and look for compromises and mutually acceptable solutions; and we are entitled to count on the same willingness from the other side. Is there such a willingness in Washington? One would like to hope this, of course, although frankly speaking there are few such hopes. The practical actions of Washington, its categorical rejection of even the very least agreement which the Soviet Union calls for, is not the best way to prepare for the Geneva meeting.

#### U.S. Arguments Disputed

LD172344 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 17 Aug 85

["Moscow Viewpoint" program presented by Valentin Zorin]

[Text] I'd like to draw your attention to a statement which Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev made on 29th July. He said that as of 6th August this country will set a moratorium on all underground nuclear tests and that it was urging the United States to follow the example. Mikhail Gorbachev had much to say about the Soviet position and the United States' reaction when he replied last Tuesday to questions from the TASS news agency. The Soviet moratorium is a concrete and very effective move to stop the arms race.

It is impossible to carry out large-scale military programs in various fields without testing nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union has been accused of a wish to achieve a propaganda effect, but isn't it clear that if a move has so far-reaching consequences, it means quite real actions and who prevents the leaders of the U.S. Administration from making a similar propaganda?

Washington has come up with another two arguments against the moratorium. First the Soviet Union has allegedly outrun the United States in the number of tests and if the United States accepts the moratorium the Soviet Union will allegedly secure unilateral advantages. But Mikhail Gorbachev noted in his interview with TASS that before announcing the moratorium the Soviet Union carried out practically as many nuclear explosions this year as the United States did. And in terms of the nuclear tests conducted to this time, the United States has carried out substantially more than the USSR and the White House is aware of this.

As I said, Washington advanced two arguments against the moratorium. The second argument is verification. And whenever the administration feels the need to reject another Soviet peace proposal, it harps on verification. But the Soviet Union is interested in verification no less, and probably more than the United States. It has many reasons to believe that leaders in Washington are by no means honoring their commitments. It would have never put forward the proposal to stop nuclear tests if it hadn't been sure that there are facilities to reliably monitor action on a corresponding agreement. Foreign experts, too, believe it's no problem to verify because there are quite reliable national means of verification.

So we can see that all the arguments used by leaders in Washington to justify their negative attitude to the Soviet proposal conflict with facts. And we can see Washington is only declaring peaceful intentions and is not ready to act in order to stop the dangerous arms race. Never before has this been more obvious to all unbiased people.

#### Bovin Article

PM210835 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Aug 85 Morning Edition p 5

[Aleksandr Bovin "Political Observer's Opinion": "Unfounded Arguments"]

[Text] The new initiative of the Soviet Union, which has introduced a moratorium on nuclear explosions and urged the United States to associate itself to this action, has been welcomed with approval in the world. "...The only important event in the sphere of arms control since the signing of the SALT II Treaty," was how Rear Admiral Eugene Carroll, retired, assistant director of the Defense Information Center in Washington, assessed the Soviet decision. And that is what many people believe, both in the United States and beyond.

Official Washington has treated the Soviet proposal differently. Without lengthy consideration the U.S. leadership has resolutely said "no." And it has backed up this "no" with one more nuclear explosion. Why? Justifying their stance, the Americans cite a number of factors. Let's take a look at these factors.

But first a few words about the thrust and history of the issue.

Nuclear weapons tests resolve several basic tasks: the creation of new types of nuclear bombs and warheads, the improvement of existing types of nuclear weapons, selective control over the quality and reliability of stockpiled munitions, and checking the survival rate of combat equipment and various types of installations.

It is not hard to understand that the reciprocal renunciation of tests and their prohibition would seriously complicate the modernization and buildup of nuclear arsenals, reduce the pace of the arms race, and promote the emergence of an atmosphere increasing the chances of success for disarmament talks.

Much has been done on the path to the total cessation of nuclear explosions. The treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, outer space, and under water was signed 5 August 1963. Some 111 states are its signatories. On 3 July 1974, the USSR and the United States signed a treaty on the limitation of underground nuclear weapons tests, which set an upper "threshold" for the yield of underground explosions: 150 kilotons. On 28 May 1976, the Soviet-U.S. treaty on underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes was signed. Although Washington has refused to ratify the two treaties, in practice the restriction on yield is being observed....

On 13 July 1977, trilateral talks began between the USSR, the United States, and Britain with a view to preparing and concluding a treaty on the total and universal prohibition of nuclear weapons tests. Almost all of its clauses were successfully agreed on. But after the 12th round of talks, 6-14 November 1980, the Americans, citing the new administration's desire to consider the situation, took "time out." On 27 July 1982, R. Reagan officially announced the U.S. refusal to resume the talks. On 29 March 1983, the United States suggested revising the control provisions envisaged by the 1974 and 1976 treaties. The Soviet Union saw no need to revise carefully honed and signed documents. The matter rested there.

Now let's return to the motivation for the U.S. refusal to accept the Soviet proposal.

First: It is hard to believe the "Russians." The Soviet Union, Washington says, announced a moratorium on nuclear weapons tests in 1958 and then violated it.

Let's investigate. The USSR suspended nuclear weapons tests as of 31 March 1958, making the duration of the moratorium conditional on the Western powers' response. On 22 August, the United States associated itself with the suspension of tests and later so did Britain. But, as early as 1 December 1959, U.S. President D. Eisenhower officially rejected the moratorium, declaring that the United States considered itself "Free to resume nuclear weapons tests." In February 1960, France began nuclear tests. In this situation and for perfectly understandable reasons, the USSR was obliged to announce the resumption of tests 30 August 1961. So it is not a question here of the Soviet Union breaking its word but of the Western powers in fact ignoring the Soviet initiative.

Second: What point is there, Washington argues, in agreeing to halt nuclear weapons tests if there are now 100 percent reliable, agreed methods of control capable of detecting violations of a potential accord, especially since the Soviet Union, in violating the 1974 treaty, "obviously" exploded devices with a yield of over 150 kilotons? The Americans need that little word "obviously" to protect themselves from charges of outright and deliberate lying. We are not making a statement, they say, we have no convincing report, we "merely" suspect. By refusing to conduct talks on improving control procedures, the Soviet Union is allegedly creating the ground for these suspicions.

This is called shifting the blame onto the innocent. It was the Americans' position which blocked the creation of systems to control the limitations and halting of nuclear tests. If Washington had ratified the 1974 treaty, the sides would long since have exchanged geological and geophysical descriptions of launch sites and testing grounds. Just as special calibrated explosions for tuning seismic apparatus would long since have been carried out.

If Washington had not broken off the trilateral talks at precisely the moment when their participants had reached the final stretch, the international exchange of seismic data would already have been organized. A legal basis would also have been established for verifications on the spot. But there is none of that. And there is none of that because, I repeat, the Americans crossed out their signature to one treaty and refused to even contemplate the other.

Control, including national and international measures of verification, is a necessary and useful business. Its task is to guarantee the detection of any deviation of importance in the military-strategic respect by either side from the "threshold" commitments it has assumed. The USSR and the United States both have sufficient potential to resolve this task. Indeed, in assessing the recent Soviet proposal, we should bear in mind that it is easier to control the total cessation of nuclear explosions than to keep track of whether the yield of an explosion has exceeded the stipulated threshold.

Of course, the competent U.S. departments understand that. And if the moaning about control continues, if complaints continue about the "obviously" perfidious "Russians," then it is in no way because teleseismic apparatus and methods are letting them down. It is their lack of political will that is letting them down.

Third: America, Washington asserts, cannot accept the Soviet proposal because the USSR is outstripping the United States in developing and modernizing nuclear weapons. We will overtake the "Russians" and then we'll talk about a moratorium.

That really is outright misleading of the public. Since 1945 the United States, not counting the recent explosion, has carried out 765 nuclear weapons tests. At least one-third more than the Soviet Union. Elementary logic dictates that given this correlation of tests, multiplied by the United States' existing level of scientific-technical potential, the Americans could hardly be "lagging." It is futile for them to feign poverty. It is not serious.

Fourth: First of all, Washington "argues," it is necessary to seek disarmament, arms reduction, and not to waste time and nerves on resolving a relatively secondary task. If we halt tests while retaining present nuclear missile arsenals, the world will not become calmer and more secure.

The Americans are dissembling. Experience has shown how complex and thorny the path to disarmament is. It is easier and simpler -- and experience has also shown this -- to agree on halting tests. After all, we nearly have agreed already!

A bilateral moratorium indeed fails to resolve the main task. In asserting this the Americans are making no big discovery. But it would create favorable conditions for preparing an international treaty on a total and universal ban on nuclear weapons tests. It would help to form those elements of trust without which the Geneva talks are so agonizingly difficult.

Fifth: The halting of nuclear weapons tests, especially for a long time, would lead to the easing of U.S. nuclear might. It would be virtually impossible to create new types of nuclear charges. Modernization would be sharply delayed. The verification of the reliability of already created nuclear weapons stockpiles would become impossible.

That is all true. But it is true not only for the United States but for the USSR. There would be a mutual and symmetrical weakening of military might. That would seem a good thing....

But a good thing only for those who are really and sincerely seeking to ease military rivalry and to strengthen strategic stability, and achieve disarmament. And it is the Washington politicians' sincerity which causes me the greatest doubts. They need ever new nuclear explosions because they need new weapons, on earth and in space. They do not want to stop the conveyor belts producing nuclear arms. That's the whole point. That is the reason why Americans fear a moratorium like the devil fears incense.

The U.S. Administration is probably offended when the sincerity of its intentions is questioned. How is that? The White House will say; we even invited a group of Soviet experts to the testing range in Nevada, let them come, let them bring any instruments to monitor the yield of the nuclear explosions.

Thanks for the kind invitaiton, of course. But we want to stop tests. And the presence of Soviet observers would be a type of "blessing" for the U.S. program for continuing tests. Where is the political sense in that? We cannot see it.

I do not rule out the possibility that the supporters of continuing nuclear explosions will formulate "sixth" or "seventh" points of further argument. Interests generate argument. But they do not guarantee its quality. "Arguments against banning tests are so unpersuasive," THE BALTIMORE SUN wrote a few days ago, "that the thought arises: Do they exist at all? They are based on the pernicious belief that a wide-scale arms race can safeguard sincerity." There is nothing to be said against that.

#### U.S. Motives Assailed

PM211005 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 21 Aug 85 p 9

[Vitaliy Kobysh "Observer's Opinion": "A Political X-ray"]

[Text] A few days ago, at the moment when Soviet nuclear test sites fell silent -- the USSR having announced that as of 6 August, the day of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima, it was declaring a moratorium on all nuclear explosions -- the United States carried out another underground test of a nuclear device in Nevada. It was not merely an open challenge to world public opinion, but a major defeat, with incalculable consequences, both for U.S. policy makers and for Washington propaganda.

The U.S. course oriented toward an arms race, primarily a nuclear arms race and its transfer to space, a course toward the use of force in relations with other states and the flouting of their sovereignty and national interests (this goes for the U.S. Nato allies as well), has probably never been so clearly highlighted as it is right now.

In these special August days of this special year of 1985 this course has been subjected to a kind of political X-ray and all has become clear to everyone, even to many of the skeptics among those who have always preferred to keep their distance from politics.

It is a difficult time for Washington's leaders. A central fact has been clearly revealed, and it is a very unpleasant experience for them. To most people living today in dread of the threat of nuclear conflict and thirsting for concrete, practical measures on the path to blocking that threat, the Soviet initiatives appear to fit the bill. Having failed to follow the USSR's example, the U.S. Administration is now busy, on the one hand, discrediting the lofty purpose of the Soviet action and, on the other, trying to justify the continuation of U.S. nuclear explosions.

As it does whenever things get difficult and it has to get out of trouble, Washington has set the propaganda wheel spinning at a furious speed. Untruths are being dispatched in all directions and through all channels in the guise of arguments and reasons.

What are these "reasons" and these "arguments?" Let us make a brief inventory.

The most common claim by representatives of the authorities in the United States and some other NATO countries is that the Soviet Union is engaging in propaganda: The answer to this, a very simple one, has already been given: Engage in the same kind of "propaganda" yourselves and it will immediately become easier to breathe in the world and people will be optimistic about nuclear weapons' eventually disappearing from the life of mankind.

Another idea that Washington apparently finds highly dangerous. Of course, they say, the Soviet Union is able to declare a moratorium because it has implemented its test program, whereas the United States has not completed its program, so there can be no question of it halting nuclear explosions. This "argument" was totally demolished by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's statement that the moratorium decision was far from easy because our country had to interrupt its own test program without completing it.

The Soviet Union took the decision, as it once pledged never to the first to use nuclear weapons, for one reason: Time will not wait; action is needed; someone has to take the first step. If the United States and not we had been first, it would have given us nothing but satisfaction.

There is yet another objective -- a very strange one, to tell the truth. In reply to the Soviet initiatives a White House spokesman stated that a moratorium is not enough in itself: What is needed is an accord "on a wide range of questions" at the current Geneva talks on space and nuclear armaments. There is no logic in that at all. Apparently, tests can be halted only if there is progress and agreement at the Geneva talks. But it is the U.S. stance that is blocking progress and agreement. It is the same old story.

Finally, monitoring -- the U.S. diplomats' salvation when they are not ready for agreement or are reluctant to reach an accord on something. This is, perhaps most of all, a deliberate attempt to mislead the general public which is not fully informed about actual state of affairs.

The facts are as follows: First, the Soviet Union is just as eager as the United States to have reliable monitoring of any agreements that are concluded. Second -- something that has been discussed before -- the scientific and technical potential that both sides possess provides the requisite degree of confidence that even a small nuclear explosion would be spotted immediately. To confirm this one could cite the evidence of a neutral expert such as Professor (Khakker), secretary of the Socialist International Consultative Council. "All measures capable of slowing down the arms race -- and the halting of tests is a very important measure -- must be taken seriously and receive a constructive reply," he writes. "The claim that a halt on tests is unmonitorable is simply untrue."



Professor (Khakker) talks of a "constructive reply." There has not been one yet. But the Soviet Union, along with all the other peoples, is still waiting for one. I have no doubt that the vast majority of Americans are also waiting a reply, because they are not bereft of common sense.

CSO: 5200/1368

NUCLEAR TESTING

USSR FURTHER CRITICIZES U.S. RESPONSE TO MORATORIUM

Reasons for Reluctance

LD310923 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0230 GMT 31 Jul 85

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Oleg Blinov]

[Text] The U.S. has reacted to the Soviet initiative. Many papers are stressing its exceptional importance and topicality. Nevertheless, it seems that official Washington has not even taken the trouble to seriously analyze the Soviet proposal. An administration spokesman issued the standard statement to the effect that the Soviet initiative is aimed, so they say, at freezing Soviet supremacy. In his turn secretary of State Shultz said that Washington will not proceed to the establishment of a moratorium because it is allegedly not in U.S. interests.

At the same time, understanding that this kind of negative reaction reveals too much the U.S. militaristic plans, Washington has simultaneously embarked--so to speak--on a coverup operation, beginning to publicize its own initiative diligently. The White House has announced the intention of inviting Soviet observers to routine underground tests of American nuclear weapons. But surely this means that the Washington administration has no intention at all of stopping the deadly competition in building up nuclear arsenals. As the NEW YORK TIMES writes, the United States is interested in continuing nuclear testing, both with the aim of developing the weapons systems necessary for star wars and in the search for ways of waging a prolonged nuclear war. It is precisely here, the paper stresses, that the fundamental reasons for the administration's obvious reluctance to agree to a moratorium and to an effective treaty on the complete and comprehensive banning of nuclear weapons tests lie.

Moscow to Japan

OW020647 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 31 Jul 85

[Commentary by Yuriy Afonin: "Second Fresh Action"]

[Excerpts] Listeners, the Soviet Union has taken another new peace initiative. General Secretary Gorbachev of the CPSU Central Committee stated on 29 July: The Soviet Union has decided to unilaterally stop all nuclear tests beginning

on 6 August and this moratorium will last until the end of this year. However, if the United States will do likewise, the moratorium will be extended. In this connection, Radio Moscow Commentator Yuriy Afonin writes:

It is no accident that 6 August has been selected to begin the nuclear test ban, for that day is now widely known throughout the world as a day of tragedy: The first American atomic bombs were dropped on Hiroshima 40 years ago. International democratic public opinion maintains that the 40th anniversary of the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki should be marked with joint action in the struggle to oppose nuclear threat, to check expansion of nuclear armament, and to eliminate nuclear arms. The CPSU and the JCP also made the same appeal in a joint communique issued in Moscow December, 1984, on the outcome of the talks held between the leaders of the two parties. And the similar appeal was voiced at the World Peace Council presidium session held in Moscow in March this year.

The current Soviet action is a great contribution to the worldwide struggle against the nuclear threat. Moreover, it is a practical contribution demonstrated not in words but in action. And this is not the first time that the Soviet Union has unilaterally taken concrete measures to check expansion of nuclear armament and to lessen the danger of nuclear wars. At the second special session of the UN disarmament committee held in 1982, the Soviet Union declared that it would not be the first to resort to nuclear weapons. Moreover, the Soviet Union has declared that it will not deploy attack satellite to outer space if other countries will only do likewise. Since April the Soviet Union has carried on moratorium on the deployment of intermediate-range missiles and other countermeasures the Soviet Union was forced to take because of U.S. missile deployment.

All of these measures taken unilaterally by the Soviet Union are of practical significance for defusing international tension and strengthening international confidence. In taking these measures, the Soviet Union has once again demonstrated to the whole world its unchanged enthusiasm for lessening and eliminating danger of nuclear wars. To our regret, however, all of these measures have failed to obtain any positive responses from Western nuclear states, particularly the United States. As a result, the world has once again come to understand who is actually making efforts with an ardent inspiration for everlasting peace and who is using nuclear weapons to establish global dominion. And the unilateral measures taken by the Soviet Union once again clearly indicate that an attempt to blame international tension and expansion of nuclear armament equally on the so-called two superpowers--the Soviet Union and the United States--is doomed to fail. In this connection, the answer to this question will once again depend on the attitude adopted by the United States.

At present, it is fully possible for the United States to demonstrate its capability not only in [words indistinct] peace but also in taking actual measures to strengthen peace. However, its initial response can hardly be taken as favorable. Rather hastily, U.S. Secretary of State Shultz has expressed doubts about the purpose of the moratorium on all nuclear tests and insisted on the difficulties of conducting inspection, though experts have testified that such inspection can possibly be conducted. Nevertheless, U.S.

leadership still has time to ponder the issue. As has been mentioned, the Soviet moratorium will last until the end of this year. Moreover, if the United States will refrain from conducting nuclear tests, the moratorium will be further extended.

This new peace-loving act of the Soviet Union enjoys worldwide support. It is also greeted with enthusiasm by participants in the 12th world Youth and Students Festival currently being held in Moscow.

Despite the attempt to distort historical facts, history will eventually put all events in their proper places. It is no accident that atomic weapons were used in 1945 by the United States, the largest imperialistic country. And it is only natural that the Soviet Union, the most powerful socialist country, has taken the initiative in banning and eliminating nuclear weapons from the time these weapons were developed and is still taking the same initiative. And in 1946, the Soviet Union proposed a complete nuclear weapons ban at the UN session. This is the logic of the modern world, as it is a world characterized by the existence of two opposing social and political systems.

The Soviet Union receives support from other socialist countries in its struggle to prevent electronic wars and this struggle conforms to the fundamental interests of the peoples in the world and all mankind. In this lies the guarantee of success in this struggle. To unite the peoples of various countries in the struggle against the danger of nuclear wars will make it possible to check the moves of those who attempt to use nuclear weapons as a means to insist on their own stance and to impose their will on others. In this connection, the Soviet Peace initiative plays an important role in uniting the people in this struggle.

PRAVDA Editorial 1 Aug

PM311551 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Aug 85 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Peace for Europe and the Whole World"]

[Excerpt] Protect the world against the threat of thermonuclear catastrophe, that is the main thrust of the activity of the CPSU and the Soviet state in the international arena. Our country consistently and persistently implements socialism's Leninist foreign policy principles, creatively developing them in relation to present-day conditions.

The new Soviet initiative put forward in the statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, is convincing evidence of the USSR's love of peace. "In a desire to promote the ending of the dangerous competition in the buildup of nuclear arsenals and wishing to set a good example, the Soviet Union has adopted a decision to unilaterally end any nuclear explosions as of 6 August this year," the document says. It calls on the U.S. government to end its nuclear explosions from the same date, which is marked throughout the world as the day of the Hiroshima tragedy. If the United States refrains from conducting nuclear explosions, the Soviet moratorium, which is imposed through 1 January 1986, will continue to operate beyond that date.

The Soviet initiative is aimed at strengthening strategic stability and peace on earth. The measure being adopted by us, if it were to become mutual and if it were observed not only by the USSR, but also by the United States, would be of truly historic significance, barring the way to a further nuclear arms race. After all, it is in the process of nuclear weapon tests that new, even more dangerous forms and types of weapons of mass destruction are developed and perfected. A reciprocal moratorium by the USSR and the United States on nuclear explosions would also serve as a good example for the other nuclear states.

The new Soviet initiative fits in with our country's general approach to disarmament problems. This is also shown by the Soviet Union's earlier unilateral measures, such as the pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons which has been in force since 1982; the imposition in 1983 of a moratorium on putting antisatellite weapons into space; and the temporary moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe announced last April.

The United States has not responded with a reciprocal action to any of the Soviet proposals. Moreover Washington, through the NATO military bloc, is whipping up the arms race. The siting of new American first-strike nuclear missiles in Western Europe continues. The components of the U.S. strategic offensive nuclear potential are being built up. NATO is implementing a program for the creation of ultramodern conventional arms whose destructive capacities approach those of nuclear weapons. New types of chemical weapons are being developed across the ocean. The U.S. Administration stubbornly seeks the implementation of its plans for "star wars" preparations, trying to involve its allies too.

#### Disarmament Envoy's Comments Hit

LD051223 Moscow in English to North American 2300 GMT 4 Aug 85

[Text] Top-ranking American officials are busy these days trying to explain to foreign audiences that moratoriums on nuclear testing are worse than continued testing:

One such official is Donald Lowitz. He is the United States Ambassador to the Geneva conference on disarmament. Last Thursday [1 August] he told the conference: We have serious doubts that moratoriums are a sound basis for a genuine agreement on verifiable testing limitations or that they would limit further growth in nuclear arsenals; in addition the United States is doubtful that moratoriums would contribute significantly to the stability and confidence that sustains disarmament negotiations, said Mr Lowitz.

Now one of the best ways to be put in charge of arms control and disarmament in the United States is not to believe in them. Kenneth Adelman became director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency after he called arms control a sham. Donald Lowitz has as much faith in it as Mr Adelman. Now what would limit further growth in nuclear arsenals and what could contribute to the stability and confidence that sustains disarmament negotiations? We are told that to achieve all that the United States and the Soviet Union should

exchange experts to monitor each other's nuclear tests. The Soviets would go to Nevada while the Americans to a Soviet site. What would such an exchange achieve? Will testing stop? No. It will be legitimized. Do they suggest that after years of such exchanges, experts will strike a lasting friendship and build the foundation for confidence in United States-Soviet relations? But there are better ways of building confidence. United States officials are telling their own people and the world that there can be no stability without tests and that moratoriums introduce a dangerous element of instability. But why? Is it because moratoriums help to slow down the escalating arms race while the United States Administration cannot live without it?

What Donald Lowitz has told the Geneva conference on disarmament could be funny if it were not so tragic. Doing away with nuclear testing will not sustain disarmament negotiations. To sustain the The White House plans to spend \$26 billion on star wars in the next 5 years, \$70 billion over the decade and God knows how much more until the end of the century and after. Building weapons instead of reducing them is the perverted logic not only of Mr Lowitz, which is very unfortunate.

#### U.S. Invitation Called 'Propaganda Trick'

LD052120 Moscow International Service in Czech and Slovak 1500 GMT 5 Aug 85

[Text] A statement by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev announces that the Soviet Union unilaterally declares a moratorium on all nuclear explosions from 6 August 1985. This step, writes Moscow Radio commentator Yuriy Solton, is inspired by the wish to make it easier to reach an agreement on a total ban on nuclear weapons tests. The Soviet Union has challenged the United States to do the same. A joint Soviet-American moratorium on nuclear explosions would also set a good example for other nuclear powers, and it would pave the way for an agreement on a comprehensive nuclear test ban, which could lead in the future to the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

Political figures and the public in many countries including the United States have greeted the Soviet initiative positively, but the public statements of American officials, however, cannot be called constructive. They say, for example, that a moratorium is impossible because it cannot be verified, or they contend that the Soviet Union has carried out many more nuclear tests and it can therefore afford to do without them for a certain period.

This has nothing in common with the truth. The Soviet moratorium has been declared until 1 January 1986. It will remain in force, however, if the United States refrains from carrying out its nuclear tests. This was made clear by the statement by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev. As far as the number of nuclear tests is concerned, there is data on this from a world affairs institute in Stockholm which was cited at a recent press conference in Moscow. According to the aggregate statistics, the United States has carried out about one-third more nuclear explosions than the Soviet Union to date, and together with the other western powers, 1.5 times more.

Equally untrue is the claim that a moratorium cannot be verified. Not only Soviet, but also leading American scientists and experts are coming to the clear conclusion that modern scientific equipment allows both sides to monitor nuclear explosions very accurately and reliably.

The American proposal to invite Soviet experts to attend a nuclear explosion in Nevada can only be assessed as a propaganda trick to distract attention. The Soviet Union has the opportunity totally to stop all nuclear tests, yet the United States invites Soviet experts, so to speak, to give their blessing, by their presence, to the continuation of American nuclear explosions.

Washington's negative official reaction to the Soviet proposal for a moratorium is evidently dictated by the requirements of the American Defense Department, the Pentagon, which, as the NEW YORK TIMES writes, needs nuclear explosions not only to upgrade its nuclear arsenals, but also to develop offensive space weapons. The American leadership still has time, however, to give careful consideration to the Soviet proposal. It has two options facing it: either to demonstrate by its actions the sincerity of its statements about the need to stop the nuclear arms race and thus reply positively to the Soviet initiative, or else to crank up the arms race even further and thereby threaten the security of all nations.

#### Reagan Press Conference

LD061411 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 6 Aug 85

[Text] President Ronald Reagan has held a press conference at which he defended the further increase in American strategic weapons and the creation of a space weapon within the framework of his Star Wars program.

During the press conference he was asked why the United States would not accept the Soviet Union's proposal and declare a joint moratorium on nuclear tests. R. Reagan declared that the United States refuses to accept the Soviet proposal. Trying to justify his position, he asserted, in contradiction of the facts, that a bilateral moratorium would be advantageous only to the Soviet Union, and that the United States needed to conduct its tests. However, when one of the correspondents protested that as far as is known, our tests have been completed, Reagan denied this. This was followed by a fresh question: Just when might this happen? In a year? Completely confused, the president of the United States said with annoyance: I don't know, I don't know.

Despite the facts which have repeatedly been cited, among others by the Soviet side and by international institutes for defense studies in various countries, the president asserted without any substantiation that the Soviet Union has carried out more tests and is proposing a bilateral moratorium so that we cannot catch up to them. The President openly ignored the circumstance that in the first half of this year, the United States and the USSR carried out equal numbers of nuclear tests.

With his statement on the rejection of the Soviet proposal, R. Reagan reaffirmed that the United States does not desire to come to agreement on such an important issue as the stopping of nuclear weapons tests. And that means that the modernization of nuclear weapons, stockpiling of them and a further arms race are the aim of the United States policy. And the President was unable to present any convincing arguments as to why the United States is avoiding acceptance of the USSR's proposal.

Attention is drawn by the fact that at the end of the press conference, an official White House spokesman gave clarifications of what R. Reagan had said, which gave an even harder interpretation to his rejection of the moratorium. The White House spokesman especially stressed that R. Reagan did not put forward any new initiative, and that the United States intends to continue the modernization of its weapons.

Thus the entire blame for the continuation of the arms race and for the breakdown of a total ban on nuclear weapons tests lies upon the United States of America.

During the press conference the President also tried to justify the barbaric bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. We dropped the bomb so as to put an end to the greatest war in the history of mankind, he asserted. I think that to talk now about it not having been necessary to adopt this decision is simply ridiculous. How far this is from the truth is shown, if only by the statements of Japanese Prime Minister Y. Nakasone, who on the same day said in an interview on NBC television: The atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki was an inhumane act. It was an attack on cities and civilian populations in violations of the norms of international law. It was an impermissible action. Politicians should make every effort to prevent something like it happening again.

#### Reagan 'Completely Confused'

LD061506 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1331 GMT 6 Aug 85

["Washington's manipulations over the Nuclear Explosion Moratorium"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 6 Aug (TASS)--Vladimir Bogachev, TASS observer on military matters, writes:

President Ronald Reagan has given a very incomprehensible "formulation" of the two conditions for the United States joining the moratorium on nuclear explosions, which, incidentally, are mutually exclusive, and tried to cast a shadow on the very idea of stopping nuclear tests.

At yesterday's White House press conference the President first of all virtually declared the "United States readiness" to cease nuclear explosions in the future, if the USSR would agree to impose a moratorium of a permanent nature. And then he put forward the second condition of the United States joining the moratorium--the completion of American nuclear weapons tests. But according to his own words, the United States "has not yet reached this stage," and he,



Reagan, "does not know" when it will reach it. In conclusion, the president, evidently having got himself completely confused, declared that solutions should allegedly be sought "not by means of such moratoriums."

The president's muddled exposition of the United States position in regard to nuclear explosions aroused confusion amongst his aides. After the press conference had ended, White House spokesman Edward Djerejian was compelled to give "clarification." He declared that Reagan had "not put forward any fresh initiative" and that before declaring a moratorium, the United States "must settle the problem of monitoring" and ensure the "modernization of American nuclear means."

In his contradictory statement President Reagan, in particular, tried to prove that an accord on a moratorium on nuclear explosions would allegedly be possible only after the creation and testing of new American strategic weapons. However, in addition to the Midgetman intercontinental ballistic missile which Reagan named, work is also under way in the United States at present on creating MX missiles, Trident-2, cruise missiles of all basing modes, and other means of mass destruction. There is no end in sight to these programs. They were begun at different times. And they will be completed at different times.

It is quite clear that in his desire to smooth over the obviously obstructionist position of the United States on the moratorium issue, Reagan is aspiring to delude world public opinion and promising United States readiness for an accord on banning nuclear explosions, as they say, "on the 12th of never."

#### U.S. Continued Testing

LD071540 Moscow TASS in English 1500 GMT 7 Aug 85

["Common Sense Must Prevail"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, August 7 TASS--By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev:

In his yesterday's statement in conjunction with the 40th anniversary of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima by U.S. Air Force, President Ronald Reagan, who had publicly reaffirmed a few days ago the refusal of the United States to follow the example of the Soviet Union and stop nuclear explosions, alleged that Washington's aim was "to set in train a process that, regarding limitations on nuclear testing, could markedly increase confidence and cooperation between our nations."

The Reagan administration has set itself the impossible task of convincing public opinion that the most dependable road toward nuclear arms reduction lies through their testing and deployment by the United States over an indefinitely long period of time. On paper Washington is for reducing nuclear arsenals, but in actual fact, it is breaking down the last barriers blocking the way of a relentless buildup of U.S. mass annihilation weapons, and refuses to make any specific practical gesture which could be regarded as a manifestation of the true desire of the United States to reduce the risk of nuclear war.

In the past four-and-a-half years the present U.S. Administration disrupted a series of negotiations on limiting the arms race--on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests, on anti-satellite weapons, on arms trade, on demilitarization of the Indian Ocean and others. Through Washington's fault the Geneva negotiations on nuclear and space arms have been deadlocked. The United States has announced its refusal to ratify the signed SALT-2 Treaty, the 1974 treaty on the limitation on underground nuclear weapon tests, and the 1976 treaty on nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes.

Now the United States announced that it is going to continue nuclear explosions, although in the opinion of an overwhelming majority of experts in all countries, their termination would be a dependable and simple step toward curbing the arms race.

Washington is trying to conceal the basic variance between the "peace" rhetoric of the present U.S. Administration and its practical actions which aggravate international tensions and intensify the arms race by an absurd propaganda story about "the reduction of arms" through their buildup by the United States.

In his statement in conjunction with the 40th anniversary of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima President Reagan described U.S. nuclear weapons as a guarantor of security and freedom and went right into inviting the Soviet Union "to work with us" on U.S. terms. One can imagine what a disastrous position our planet would find itself in, if the Soviet Union engaged in "disarmament" following Washington's recipes--undercutting the existing treaties, placing weapons in space, relentlessly accelerating the production of nuclear arms and their testing, refusing to make the slightest gesture of good will with a view to lessening the danger of universal war.

The decision of the Soviet Union to stop nuclear explosions and the negative reaction of the United States to that exceptionally important gesture of good will on the part of the USSR come as a vivid demonstration of the difference in the stance of the two countries on questions of war and peace.

The Soviet Union hopes that common sense will prevail in Washington at long last and that after all the U.S. Administration will decide to discontinue nuclear explosions, thus, making its first step toward resolving the problem of nuclear arms for the good of the whole of mankind.

#### Military Paper Comment

PM081015 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 Aug 85 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "For the Sake of the Future of all Peoples"]

[Text] The main avenue of the Leninist foreign policy which the CPSU and the Soviet state persistently and consistently steer is to safeguard mankind from the threat of a thermonuclear catastrophe. A world without wars and weapons, a world of good-neighborliness and cooperation, a world of friendship among the peoples--that is the ideal of socialism.

The Western imperialist circles and above all the United States are guided by diametrically opposite goals. They are conducting an unrestrained arms race and are building up and improving at an accelerated rate all types of weapons, especially weapons of mass annihilation. Mankind is faced with a choice: either to make resolute efforts to halt and reverse this dangerous process or to allow the armaments frenzy to overwhelm civilization and to jeopardize its existence and the future of all peoples of the world.

Under these conditions, seeking to help end the dangerous rivalry in the build-up of nuclear arsenals and anxious to set a good example, the USSR has come out with a new initiative of enormous importance which it is hard to overestimate. "The Soviet Union," says the 29 July statement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, "has decided to unilaterally halt any nuclear explosions as of 6 August this year." He appealed to the U.S. Government to halt its own nuclear explosions as of the same date. The Soviet moratorium was announced for the period through 1 January 1986. It will, however, operate longer if the United States for its part refrains from nuclear explosions.

The Soviet initiative has met with resolute support and ardent approval from all progressive mankind, from all those who realistically assess the situation prevailing in the international arena and are sincerely interested in easing the threat of thermonuclear war. Because the step the Soviet Union has taken, by becoming a mutual step observed not only by the USSR but also by the United States, would acquire truly historical significance, cutting off paths to a further nuclear arms race. After all, it is known that it is in the process of testing nuclear weapons that new, even more dangerous, kinds and types of weapons of mass annihilation are developed and improved. At the same time a mutual moratorium by the Soviet Union and the United States on nuclear explosions would serve as a good example to other states with nuclear weapons and would open the way to an agreement on banning all nuclear tests.

Without tests the nuclear arms race would with time become virtually impossible. That is the point of the USSR's policy aimed at a total ban on nuclear weapons tests. Ultimately it would lead to the abolition of all stockpiled nuclear arsenals. That would be a reliable guarantee of the prevention of nuclear war.

The Soviet Union is persistently seeking to abolish nuclear weapons completely. If an accord is reached with the other nuclear powers, the USSR is prepared at any moment to embark on nuclear disarmament. It is conducting talks with the United States to prevent the arms race in space, to halt the arms race on earth, and to move to a radical reduction of nuclear arms and on to their total abolition.

The Soviet Union's decision to introduce a moratorium on any nuclear explosions has entered into force. As M.S. Gorbachev's reply to the appeal from the Japanese council of organizations of victims of the atomic bombings states, it is now up to the United States and the other states with nuclear weapons also to put an end to their nuclear explosions.

But the U.S. side is declining to conduct a businesslike discussion of even the idea of a moratorium on nuclear explosions. There can be only one explanation here: Washington does not want to halt its programs to build up first-strike nuclear forces--in the field of strategic offensive armaments, in the field of medium-range nuclear weapons, and in the creation of space-based offensive weapons systems--aimed at disrupting the military-strategic equilibrium which exists between the USSR and the United States and achieving positions of superiority. The U.S. side's position is also blocking the attainment of an agreement at the Geneva talks whose aim is to draft effective accords aimed at preventing the arms race in space and halting it on earth, at limiting and reducing nuclear arms, and at strengthening strategic stability.

The United States' calculations of achieving military-strategic superiority over the socialist countries and dictating its will to them are not destined to come true. The Soviet Union and its allies will never allow it. However, they take into account the fact that the problems now facing mankind cannot be resolved on the path of the arms race. The interests of all peoples of the world demand a different path, joint steps aimed at the immediate halt of the nuclear arms race; a radical reduction of nuclear arms; and the prevention of the use of outer space in the arms race.

The Soviet Union's decision to initiate a moratorium on any nuclear explosions was a major step on this path. It is no accident that a number of statements by representatives of the world public concerned about the destiny of peace and the comments of foreign press organs express the hope that the U.S. Administration has not yet said its final word in response to the USSR's new manifestation of goodwill and that the United States will associate itself with the moratorium announced by the Soviet Union. This solution of the problem would accord with the aspirations and vital interests of all peoples.

The stance which the U.S. side persistently continues to take cannot fail to alarm us. It is fraught with terrible new dangers for all mankind. That is why, under present conditions, the peoples are required to display the greatest vigilance and determination to pool their efforts to thwart the sinister intentions of the imperialist circles of the United States and other Western countries. The Soviet servicemen have unanimously joined their voices to the voices of all Soviet people, who warmly approve the USSR's new initiative expressing the aspirations and hopes of all peoples for a peaceful future. The USSR Armed Forces servicemen see their patriotic and international duty in strengthening their vigilance and combat readiness and persistently improving their combat skill. They are fully determined to continue to reliably and vigilantly safeguard the security of their people and the destiny of all peoples of the world.

Assistant Secretary Refuted

LD081816 Moscow TASS in English 1755 GMT 8 Aug 85

[Text] Washington, August 8 TASS--U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Rozanne Ridgway made a televised statement which had a nature of the explanation of the U.S. president's stand with regard to the Soviet Union's proposal to end

all nuclear explosions. R. Ridgway asserted that the United States cannot accept the Soviet proposal for the reason that it, allegedly, is not corroborated by measures of adequate control.

The assistant secretary of state declared that the United States must stage a regular series of nuclear weapons tests, including tests of weapons of new types. That part of her statement shows clearly that the Reagan administration does not want to ban nuclear explosions, that it intends to continue the arms race.

It should be noted that Ridgway said that the question of the moratorium should be decided in Geneva, at arms control talks. Meanwhile, it is known that the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva have no direct bearing on the ending of nuclear tests. Such a stand is prompted by the United States' striving to drag out the discussion of the moratorium, to link it with questions of arms control and to continue nuclear weapon tests. It is not accidental that a considerable part of Ridgway's statement was devoted to justifying Reagan's policy of spreading the arms race to space. In this connection she asserted that work in the framework of the so-called "Strategic Defence Initiative" is due to the fact that the Soviet Union, allegedly, has already been conducting similar work in space and that U.S. steps are counter-measures to the USSR's actions.

It is well known that such statements contradict the real state of things. The Soviet Union is not conducting any work aimed at the militarization of space. The assistant secretary of state ignored the fact that the USSR announced unilaterally the decision not to be the first to put anti-satellite weapons into space and suggested that both sides should introduce a mutual moratorium for the duration of the talks on the development, including research, on tests and deployment of strike space arms.

#### U.S. 'Sidestepping' Issue

PM120700 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Aug 85 Morning Edition p 5

[Report by V. Matveyev "Political Observer's Opinion": "Mindless Zeal"]

[Text] One cannot but agree with those commentators and influential politicians in various countries who are pointing to the importance of creating a favorable atmosphere in connection with the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit. Even official Washington spokesmen are making statements on this subject. More often than not their statements are leveled in one direction. I mean at the Soviet Union. Our country and its mass media are asked to show "restraint" as far as Soviet-U.S. relations are concerned. But what about the American side? Does this not apply to it too? Should it not also be concerned with ensuring that nothing extraneous or artificial complicates the atmosphere of the forthcoming meeting, which is attracting such attention around the world?

The answer is obvious, but unfortunately not to all responsible U.S. figures. Across the ocean they continue to constantly make speeches and give interviews attesting to anything but a desire for a balanced, serious approach to the question on which progress along the road of strengthening the foundations of international security and peace depends. When our country announced the

the introduction of a unilateral moratorium on any nuclear explosions and asked the United States to follow this example, the Pentagon chiefs were the lowest of all in opposing a positive response.

During the past few days U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger has outdone even himself in his exhortations against Soviet-U.S. accords which would promote the normalization of bilateral relations and correspond to the interests of world peace. "We have entirely different systems," Weinberger said 1 August, according to an AP report.

Different systems... Does that mean the two countries are doomed to remain in a state of permanent hostility? The governments of many U.S. partners do not subscribe to that conclusion. For the Pentagon chief's information: Differences in social systems do not prevent European states from successfully co-operating in many spheres.

Mr Weinberger has many ambitions, but he lacks honesty. He of all people should recall, for instance, that in terms of numbers of warheads the United States has an advantage over our country. Yet just the other day he claimed: "We do not have a warhead for each Soviet warhead."

What is this, a poor memory, or a deliberate distortion of the known facts? Seemingly the latter. The world public can judge how intolerant these figures are of the very idea of curbing the arms race. They cannot conceive of either the present or the future without increasingly sophisticated weaponry. They are incapable of hiding their position, which is dangerous to the cause of peace. And, realizing the impression this makes on the public, they try to give it some semblance of "basis."

At the time Weinberger was excoriating the very idea of developing normal relations with our country he gave free rein, so to speak, to his feelings about the new Soviet initiative. There is a material ulterior motive behind Washington's negative reaction to the USSR's appeal to follow its good example and introduce a moratorium on nuclear explosions. In a letter dated 17 June this year Frank Gaffney, U.S. deputy assistant secretary of defense, pointed out: "...Nuclear explosions are necessary to develop and create nuclear arms...."

That is why a total nuclear test ban is important to peace supporters, and why the rejection of such a ban is important to their opponents. The overwhelming majority of UN member states side with the first viewpoint, as repeatedly approved General Assembly resolutions show. A narrow circle of NATO governments headed by the United States takes the latter view.

The new Soviet initiative has put U.S. and NATO militarist circles in a difficult position. In the United States alone the leaders of 150 public organizations recently appealed to the government to react positively to the Soviet initiative. On behalf of 135,000 physicians from 14 countries Bernard (Laun), cochairman of the international movement "International Physicians Against Nuclear War," called on President Reagan to "study the Soviet Government proposal positively." A similarly couched resolution was submitted to the Senate by E. Kennedy (Democrat) and C. Mathias (Republican).

Similar appeals are being made in many countries. Under these conditions the Pentagon chiefs have decided not to draw attention to their programs for building up nuclear arms as the real reason for their reluctance to follow the Soviet example. They are trying to maneuver and finagle. Claims are made about the "impossibility of verifying" the observance of the agreement on the total prohibition of nuclear tests. These references are being used by C. Weinberger in staunchly opposing a comprehensive test ban.

With what does the Pentagon chief back up these claims? Nothing. Not counting E. Teller, the "father of the hydrogen bomb," who back in the fifties militated for siting nuclear weapons on the moon, and a handful of similarly manic Pentagon followers, the main core of world-renowned scientists have long since unreservedly recognized the feasibility of effective monitoring and verification measures for observing an agreement on the complete ending of nuclear tests. Our country was ready back in 1963, when the talks on a partial nuclear test ban were successfully completed, to embark on ending underground nuclear tests. But the Pentagon wanted to retain a loophole for further upgrading its nuclear arsenal. At the time the U.S. side cited the "difficulty of verifying" underground explosions.

One practical result of the 10th Pugwash Conference of scientists held in September 1962 was the proposal to improve the effectiveness of means for detecting underground tests with the help of automatic sealed seismographs which could be sited on Soviet and U.S. territory. On 13 March 1963 THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR wrote: "The art of detecting nuclear explosions and the ability to distinguish them from earthquakes has been perfected to such a degree that the United States can calmly agree to a complete test ban, including underground explosions, and rely on its own detection systems...."

It is strange to see what the same newspaper wrote about Washington's reluctance to agree to a total test ban: "Pentagon representatives do not want the United States to end tests outright, believing that great strides can still be made; for instance, in the creation of the neutron bomb."

The newspaper, as we can see, was well informed. The loophole concerning underground explosions allowed the Pentagon to embark on the production of neutron weapons as well as other new types of mass destruction weapons.

Writing in the July-September issue of the influential U.S. foreign policy journal FOREIGN AFFAIRS, William Foster, then director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, having irrefutable figures to hand, noted: "Thanks to technical achievements it will now be easy to distinguish earthquakes from possible underground explosions."

It is well known that, in line with the treaty on limiting the yield of underground nuclear weapon tests signed between our country and the United States in 1974, both sides developed a detailed system for using their existing national technical means for monitoring the fulfillment of the treaty. The introduction of such a system would pave the way to a total ban on underground nuclear tests.



The U.S. Government refuses to ratify this treaty to avoid being bound by commitments that prevent it from developing new mass destruction weapons systems.

The references to "verification difficulties" represent a pathetic subterfuge on the part of those who would like to have not a total test ban but total freedom to develop their own destructive and savage military means both quantitatively and qualitatively.

For more than a quarter of a century, starting with the conferences of experts in Geneva in the fifties, the theoretical and practical feasibility of verifying an agreement banning underground nuclear explosions has been established and effective means for monitoring such a ban have been developed.

In breaking off the talks on a comprehensive nuclear test ban, the U.S. Government also avoided discussing the question of monitoring and verification measures.

This sidestepping has nothing to do with "verification difficulties." It is a question not of objective obstacles and difficulties but of subjective schemes and calculations on achieving the desired U.S. domination and supremacy in the military sphere. This was clear even before. But is now even more graphically obvious in the obstructionist line of the current U.S. Administration, which will bear a grave responsibility if the aspirations and hopes of millions of people on all continents and most UN members for a total nuclear test ban fail to materialize.

PRAVDA Editorial 10 Aug

PM121600 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Aug 85 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Averting the Nuclear Threat"]

[Text] The clock of history shows a round figure with regard to U.S. imperialism's barbaric crime against mankind; the 40th anniversary of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The echo of that tragedy, which has left a deep mark on people's memories, appeals to the conscience and reason of every honest person. After all, it is clear that if nuclear weapons were used today, it would have catastrophic consequences for all peoples.

Protecting the world from the threat of thermonuclear catastrophe is the main concern of the CPSU and the Soviet State. In the present tense international situation, which is burdened with the arms race on earth and the danger of its extension to space, they are waging an energetic and tireless struggle to limit and ultimately eliminate means of mass destruction and create an atmosphere of trust and peaceful cooperation among states.

Wishing to help end the dangerous rivalry in the buildup of nuclear potentials, the Soviet Union has taken a new step: From 6 August this year, the anniversary of the Hiroshima tragedy, it unilaterally ended all nuclear explosions. This moratorium is declared until 1 January 1986 but will continue to operate thereafter if the United States also refrains from carrying out nuclear explosions.



The Soviet Union has persistently striven to eliminate nuclear weapons ever since they appeared. Back in 1946 our country proposed an international convention banning nuclear weapons, but the United States obstructed the implementation of that proposal. Ever since, the USSR has consistently and actively struggled against the stockpiling of nuclear arsenals and for an end to the rivalry in the creation of increasingly sophisticated weapon systems of this type.

Thirty years ago, in 1955, the Soviet Union proposed to all states possessing atomic and hydrogen weapons that a commitment to end tests of those weapons be adopted. That proposal, however, was not implemented owing to the negative stance of the Western powers. Our country's efforts played a decisive role in the conclusion in 1963 of the treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space, and underwater.

In 1974, the USSR and United States signed a treaty limiting the yield of underground nuclear weapons tests and, in 1976, they signed a treaty regulating nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. It is not our country's fault that those treaties remain unratified to this day. On the Soviet Union's initiative tripartite talks involving the USSR, the United States, and Britain began in 1977 with the aim of formulating a treaty on the complete and general banning of nuclear weapon tests. And even though considerable progress was achieved in the formulation of such a treaty, the United States and subsequently Britain refused to continue the talks.

Washington's attitude to the problem of ending nuclear tests is one of outright sabotage. What lies behind it is a desire to smash the existing balance of forces and achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. The new U.S. military programs for the creation and improvement of nuclear, conventional, and space armaments are aimed at achieving this adventurist goal. But the continuation of the arms race is a futile path. It only leads to the destabilization of the situation, a senseless waste of resources, and the intensification of the threat of war.

Now, when our country has declared a unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions, the exceptional importance of this act is obvious. Tests are a type of accelerator of the nuclear arms race. The ending of nuclear explosions would sharply slow down this entire process. Without tests there would be no modernization or improvement of new types of weapons, developments which result from such tests. This, in turn, means that a real barrier can be placed in the way of the nuclear arms race, which contains the threat of nuclear catastrophe.

For the first time in recent years an opportunity has appeared in the complex international situation to take a concrete and practical step with the prospect of "snuffing out" the nuclear arms race. Neither preliminary talks nor special control measures are needed for this. All it needs is goodwill and a readiness to follow the USSR's example. A world without nuclear explosions; such a prospect meets the aspirations and hopes of all peoples. That is confirmed by the resolute approval and broad support with which world public opinion greeted the new Soviet initiative.

When making its decision the Soviet Union appealed to the U.S. Administration to end its nuclear explosions also. It expressed the hope the United States would respond positively to that appeal. After all, a mutual USSR and U.S. moratorium would also set a good example for other states possessing nuclear weapons. A real contribution would thus be made to strengthening strategic stability and peace on earth and favorable conditions would be created for concluding an international treaty on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests.

However, the USSR's important initiative has not met with a positive response in Washington. There they have begun looking for and inventing various justifications and subterfuges in order to avoid the Soviet proposal. To this end it has been proclaimed a "propaganda move" across the ocean and the ridiculous claim is made that by imposing a moratorium on all nuclear explosions the USSR wants to overtake the United States in nuclear arms. The false thesis has also been dredged up that it is impossible to monitor the observance of a moratorium on nuclear explosions. The United States is thus demonstrating yet again that it does not want to discuss in a businesslike and concrete fashion or, which is the main point, to solve practically questions concerning nuclear arms limitation. The United States is demonstrating to the whole world its disregard for the interests of the peoples and of international security.

The nuclear threat must be averted. That is the peoples' will.

Weekly Talk Show 11 Aug

LD112108 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 11 Aug 85

["International Observers Roundtable" with Vladimir Borisovich Lomeyko, writer on international affairs; Aleksey Mikhaylovich Vasilyev, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Africa; Aleksandr Vladimirovich Zholkver, Central Television and All-Union Radio political observer]

[Text] [Zholkver] Hello, comrades! Last week in international life was notable for an important event: The unilateral moratorium by the Soviet Union on all underground explosions came into force. The timing of this major new peace initiative by our country was most symbolic, for it was precisely in that week that two dark dates in world history were marked: the 40th anniversary of the U.S. atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Understandably, the decision by the Soviet Union to halt all nuclear explosions had the widest possible positive response in Japan, which suffered the horrors of the atomic raids. Here I would note in particular the reaction of the Japanese organizations of atomic bomb victims, who were very satisfied with the message from Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev that stressed that the Soviet people, who lost 20 million people during World War II, are fully resolved to prevent a nuclear catastrophe.

Many statesmen, public figures and prominent scientists are now calling on the other nuclear powers, first and foremost the United States, to follow the example of the Soviet Union and end underground explosions, which would enable the highly dangerous atomic arms race to be stopped.

I think that all these problems occupied an important place, too, at the anniversary meeting last week in Helsinki of the participants in the all-European conference. You took part in that meeting, Vladimir Borisovich. What were your impressions?

[Lomeyko] Yes, you know just on the eve of the opening of the anniversary meeting in Helsinki all the participants learned of the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on the introduction of the unilateral moratorium by the Soviet Union on all nuclear explosions. Many of the delegates stressed in their very first speeches that if the United States were to support this unilateral step by the Soviet Union, other nuclear powers might follow, which would lay the path to a complete ban on nuclear explosions. I witnessed how the journalists literally bombarded U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz with questions about the American attitude to the Soviet proposal when he arrived in Helsinki. Many of them could not conceal their surprise when he literally rejected the proposal out of hand, not even having taken the trouble to study it.

On the other hand, the attempt by the U.S. representative to put forward, as a counter-proposal, an invitation for Soviet specialists to attend a nuclear test in Nevada brought only skeptical smiles to the faces of many observers. Even among the closest allies of the United States one could hear bewildered questions. What comparison is there between these two completely different approaches? Moscow proposes that nuclear explosions be ended, while the United States invites people to watch while they are being continued. Instead of banning the evil, they aim to give it prominence and, to boot, in the presence of the people it is aimed against.

[Zholkver] There was, however, the argument--and I don't know whether it was brought up in Helsinki, but I have seen it in numerous articles in the U.S. press and in statements by U.S. representatives--that this issue comes up against the problem of verification. If there are representatives there, they say, and they bring their instruments with them, then it will be possible, they say, to verify whether or not nuclear tests are being carried out. U.S. scientists themselves, though, stress that national facilities for detection are at such a high level that it is possible to verify not only the fact that a nuclear explosion has taken place, but also its strength.

[Lomeyko] You know, that, one may say, is the core of the American argument--the stress on the problem of verification. But--and you have already mentioned the opinion of U.S. scientists--it must be said that many prominent specialists, including Finnish ones, share that opinion. For example, I was there when (Illoniemi), deputy director of the Tampere Institute for research into problems of peace and conflict, said that today's equipment enables nuclear explosions to be observed without being there on site. And here is the opinion of yet another specialist--Korhonen, director of the Seismology Center of Helsinki University. He pointed out that in addition to the national detection facilities there is the increasingly effective international network of control and seismological information exchange which includes, among others, information centers in Moscow, Washington, and Stockholm. So if one approaches this question seriously, without any touch of propaganda, one can always come to agreement quite easily. The most important thing is missing: the political will and the desire on the part of the United States. That, in fact, is the essence of the problem, that is where the problem lies.

[Zholkver] And in general, of course, this is not a bilateral or a trilateral problem, but a problem for the whole world, a problem for all mankind, if one may put it that way. Isn't that so, Aleksey Mikhaylovich?

[Vasilyev] Yes, and the problem concerns not just the nuclear countries but countries that do not possess nuclear weapons. The problem of struggling against nuclear weapons concerns all the developing countries. Everyone knows that the ecological consequences of a thermonuclear war would be catastrophic for those countries, even if not a single nuclear bomb exploded on their territory. There would be the well-known phenomenon of the nuclear winter, as it is called, threatening the destruction--the freezing to death, so to speak--of human civilization. That is why the decision by the Soviet leadership to put a moratorium on tests gave rise to a positive reaction in Minister Rajiv Gandhi of India, who said that we must not forget the victims of Hiroshima while human awareness exists and while mankind expresses alarm over the destiny of his civilization.

[Zholkver] I must say, however, that different opinions are also voiced. I saw an interview given by Weinberger, the head of the U.S. war department. He was asked: If you had to take the decision 40 years ago, would you have dropped the atomic bomb on Hiroshima? Weinberger replied: Yes, I would have given the order. And you know I think that it is not only the moral aspect of this that is important. The whole point appears to be that although they dropped the bombs on Japanese cities, the idea of it was not just against Japan: The design was to secure global domination throughout the world for the United States, and it was aimed to a considerable degree against the Soviet Union. Just remember Potsdam, when it became known that the United States had carried out its first atomic weapon test, and Truman wrote in his diary: This thing will enable us to talk differently to the Russians. That is whom it was aimed against.

[Vasilyev] Many historians have written, both recently and in the past, that in practice the atomic bombs used against Japan were the first action of the cold war, which started at that time.

[Zholkver] And also the results of archive research by a Japanese professor, (?Mikio Kaku) have just been published. In the archives of New York University this scientist found documents confirming that the U.S. Administration headed by President Truman was hatching plans at the end of August 1946 for the atomic bombing of the Soviet Union. It wasn't carried out, but only because initially, according to the documents, Washington had only seven atomic bombs, which was not enough; then, as everyone knows, the Soviet Union took countermeasures. But after that, plans were drawn up to use nuclear weapons against China, against Korea, and against Vietnam. So this was connected with the global designs of the aggressive circles of imperialism. That was in the past, but now and, in a sense, in the future it is connected with similar plans to switch the arms race to space.

[Lomeyko] I would say that the psychology of the atomic fist which manifested itself in August 1945, and the claim to hegemony with the help of the new miracle weapon, as they pictured it at that time in America, has made itself

felt up to the present day. You see, in point of fact, it lies at the root of all the U.S. Administration's negative replies to all the Soviet Union's peace initiatives aimed at destroying nuclear weapons. What we see today--that is, the American side's refusal to support the Soviet Union's proposal--is in fact determined by just one thing, an unwillingness to ban nuclear explosions which give the Pentagon the opportunity to perfect and modify nuclear weapons and to create new types of this weaponry, in order to further continue the nuclear arms race.

#### U.S. 'Avoiding' Proposal

LD121530 Moscow World Service in English 1310 GMT 12 Aug 85

[Text] The Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions is in effect as of 6th August. Also in force is an official proposal made earlier to the United States Government to follow the Soviet initiative and on its part renounce nuclear testing. Here is what Radio Moscow news analyst Yuriy Soltan writes:

A joint Soviet-American moratorium on nuclear explosions would not infringe on anyone's security. On the contrary, there would appear a practical opportunity to start a sort of chain reaction in nuclear disarmament. But such a turn of events is clearly not to Washington's liking.

It does everything to avoid accepting the Soviet proposal and the negative approach is covered up with fabrications, falsehoods and even slander. In their recent statements, U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz and Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger claimed that it is impossible to agree to the Soviet proposal because the Russians, allegedly, cannot be trusted. Well, we'll leave that claim to their conscience, though the question that naturally arises is why, then, should the Russians trust the United States, which refuses to follow the Soviet example and pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. And yet the Soviet Union decided to introduce a moratorium unilaterally. So what prevents the United States from doing the same? They say there would be difficulties controlling the explosions, but today all nuclear explosions, wherever they take place, are at once registered by satellites and other technical means. The place of the explosion and its power capacity are determined with great accuracy. Even former CIA chief William Colby said that a moratorium on nuclear explosions can be verified through existing national technical means, and, of course, William Colby knew what he was talking about.

Two prominent American seismologists, (Sykes) and (Evernden), said that existing seismic equipment is quite enough to control an agreement in the field. The scientists say that the problems connected with talks on working out a comprehensive treaty, that is a treaty on banning nuclear tests universally, are of a political nature not a scientific one. And that's the crux of the matter. When questioning the possibility of verifying a moratorium on nuclear explosions official Washington is playing an unfair game. In fact, the United States has always advanced the argument about control when it wanted to avoid this or that proposal on limiting arms or disarmament, and it is doing the same now. Actually control has nothing to do with the problem. In Nevada the

United States is testing and perfecting new samples of offensive nuclear arms, including space weapons. Washington is still under the illusion that, with the help of those weapons, it will be able to upset the military parity in its favor and ensure a victory in a nuclear war. And that is where the real reason should be sought for the refusal of official Washington to join the Soviet moratorium.

#### SDI Connection Alleged

LD081401 Moscow TASS in English 1344 GMT 8 Aug 85

["Nuclear Testing in Preparation for 'Star Wars'"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, August 8 TASS--TASS political news analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

Commenting on the refusal of the United States Administration to follow the Soviet Union's example and introduce a moratorium on nuclear blasts, a correspondent of the Japanese YOMIURI newspaper in Washington writes today that the real cause behind the stand is Washington's preparations for "star wars." Quoting U.S. military sources, he points out that the USA considers it necessary to preserve for itself the possibility of conducting nuclear blasts as a source of energy for high-powered lasers. This idea is also expressed in the newspaper THE WASHINGTON POST today. The advisers to the President, the newspaper points out, are opposing the moratorium in the first place because it would prevent the testing of nuclear weapons, which is considered vital to the "star wars" programme.

Both sources, as we see, point to one and the same cause why the Washington administration does not wish to end nuclear testing--it is the programme for a militarization of outer space, i.e. "star wars" preparations.

They in Washington, as before, are stubbornly continuing their policy of carrying on the nuclear weapons race, building up the nuclear potential, perfecting it and creating new types of weapons, including strike space weapons. In so doing the current administration actually displays disregard for the existing international and bilateral agreements on a partial limitation of arms. Thus, the X-ray laser weapon with the use of nuclear blasts in outer space is source of energy for such plants, which is mentioned in the Japanese newspaper as being developed within the framework of the "Strategic Defence Initiative." This is reported also in the U.S. NEWSWEEK magazine.

These weapons are being developed contrary to the provisions of the treaty of 1967, whose article 4 prohibits the deployment of nuclear weapons in outer space.

To evade that prohibition, experts of the administration are elaborating a so-called "pop-up system", according to which nuclear weapons will be placed in outer space "not permanently", but launched from the earth should military considerations require that. This indicates that Washington views outer space as a field of possible military conflicts.

The U.S. Administration's practical activities show that the Washington leaders far from wishing to abandon the path of the arms race, but have, on the contrary, set out to spread it to outer space. To this end, as the Pentagon experts admit, they need nuclear tests.

By imposing a moratorium on all nuclear blasts, the Soviet Union shows in action the best way to a real cut in and total scrapping of weapons on earth. Yet the sole way to put an end to the arms race--is to halt it really, rather than try to deceive its opponents and the world public by empty peace rhetoric.

CSO: 5200/1353

## NUCLEAR TESTING

### SOVIET BROADCAST TO JAPAN ON HIROSHIMA, MORATORIUM

OW071241 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 5 Aug 85

[Commentary by Colonel Serbin, military historian, on the 40th anniversary of atomic bombing of Hiroshima]

[Excerpts] An American atomic bomb was dropped with a parachute on Hiroshima at 0815 on the morning of 6 August 1945--the first atomic bombing in the history of mankind. Three days later on 9 August, another atomic bomb was dropped on Nagasaki. About 15 minutes before the bombing, an air-raid alarm was issued in Hiroshima. At the appearance of only one U.S. Air Force plane, however, the people were not terrified at all and they did not run to air-raid shelters for cover. This was precisely what the planners of the bombing had expected.

By sunset, Hiroshima was literally turned into ruins. All the buildings within 2 kilometers of the center of the explosion were destroyed and those within 12 kilometers were seriously damaged. About 70 percent of the 90,000 houses were either wiped out or greatly damaged, and some 270,000 noncombatants, including women and children, were killed.

What on earth was the reason that had caused the United States, a country that proclaims itself as a civilized state, to take such an action of mass destruction in killing hundreds of thousands of noncombatants? Or was it a fatal mistake? It certainly was not so. The U.S. Government that used to urge other countries to practice justice and humanitarianism had consciously and composedly declared the massacre of the people first in Hiroshima and later in Nagasaki.

Why did the U.S. military authorities have to wipe out large Japanese cities that did not have military facilities? The true purpose of the atomic bombing on Hiroshima is revealed in the following remarks by then U.S. President Truman, who once told his assistant in charge of the atomic bombing: If the atomic bomb explodes successfully, I will have a stick against them in my hand. In saying "them," President Truman meant the Soviet people.

Following the Second World War, the United States has taken the road of world domination. While confirming this line, President Truman once stated: Whether we like it or not, our victory urges our people to realize that they should



assume the responsibility of guiding the world. In fact, the U.S. leadership has imposed on the world heavy burdens created by their irresponsible words and actions.

Atomic bombs have become a major weapon to help the U.S. ruling clique carry out its scheme of world domination. From 1946 to 1975, the United States threatened to use strategic nuclear weapons on 19 occasions and it threatened to use them directly against the Soviet Union on 4 occasions. The U.S. Government did not seem to be worried at all about the outcome of such a threat. To the United States, wars, armed conflicts and [words indistinct] have become an everyday affair. During the first 30 years after the war, the United States used armed force on 215 occasions. And during the past 10 years--particularly since the inauguration of the Reagan administration--military adventurist and state terrorist acts against Lebanon, Grenada, Nicaragua, Afghanistan and other countries have become quite frequent.

The United States that announced the beginning of an expansion of its nuclear armament on 6 August 1945, still attempts to attain superiority in armaments over the Soviet Union in order to protect imperialist interests all over the world, and this has aroused great apprehension. The United States has enforced its preparations for star wars, wars in outer space, carried out an unprecedentedly large-scale nuclear armament program, and surrounded the socialist countries with its own nuclear weapons. Moreover, it is attempting to turn Japan, on which it dropped mankind's first atomic bomb 40 years ago, into a major nuclear base in Asia. This is an action that can only be termed as a sacriligious practice against Japan.

The expansion of nuclear armaments that has been carried on since 1945 imperils the future of world civilization. Through a sense of responsibility about the future of the world, the Soviet Union has unilaterally started a new initiative, deciding on a moratorium on all nuclear tests beginning on 6 August this year until 1 January next year and calling on the United States to do the same. Should the United States agree to stop nuclear tests, this moratorium would remain effective even after 1 January.

The new Soviet peace initiative has aroused many responses in Japan and it has opened up practical prospects not only for stopping nuclear armament but also for reducing and abolishing existing nuclear weapons. And this conforms to the aspirations of peace-loving public opinion on earth as well as of all mankind.

CSO: 5200/1353

NUCLEAR TESTING

BRIEFS

GORBACHEV STATEMENT CIRCULATED AT UN--New York August 2 TASS--The text of the July 29, 1985 statement by the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev on the Soviet Union's decision to suspend unilaterally all nuclear blasts starting with this August 6th has been circulated in the United Nations organization as an official document of the United National General Assembly. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1606 GMT 2 Aug 85 LD]

END

CSO: 5200/1353